

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES TROTTER,
Plaintiff,
vs.
ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:10-cv-01971 LJO JLT (PC)
ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS
(Doc. 28)

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On August 25, 2011, the assigned Magistrate Judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that Plaintiff’s motion for law library access be denied. (Doc. 28.) The assigned Magistrate Judge explained that T. Peterson, the individual allegedly denying Plaintiff law library access, is not before the Court in this case and therefore the Court has no power to issue injunctive relief from that individual. (Id. at 3.)

The findings and recommendations contained notice that any objections were to be filed within fourteen days of service. As of the date of this order, Plaintiff has not filed objections to the findings and recommendations.¹

¹ Plaintiff filed a motion for an extension of time on September 13, 2011, presumably to file objections to the findings and recommendations. (Doc. 29.) However, the motion was denied because Plaintiff failed to show good cause for an extension of time. (Doc. 30.)

1 The Court has conducted a de novo review of this case in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §
2 636(b)(1)(C). Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds that the findings and
3 recommendations are supported by the record and the proper analysis.

4 Accordingly, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's January 3, 2011 motion for law
5 library access (Doc. 21) is **DENIED**.

6
7
8
9
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 **Dated: September 15, 2011**

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE