| UNITED                   | STATES DISTRICT COURT  |
|--------------------------|--|
| EAST                     | TERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |
| ALVIN R. ROSS,           | CASE NO. 1:10-cv-02075-AWI-GBC PC  |
| Plaintiff,<br>v.         | ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND<br>RECOMMENDATIONS RECOMMENDING<br>DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR                                      |
| DERRAL G. ADAMS, et al., | RECONSIDERATION  |
| Defendant.               | (Docs. 9, 10, 11)  |
|                          | /  |
|                          | a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights activity November 9, 2010. (Doc. 1.) The matter was referred to a Unit |

Plaintiff Alvin R. Ross, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on November 9, 2010. (Doc. 1.) The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302 and on December 13, 2010, an <u>order was issued dismissing the action due to his being denied in forma pauperis status</u> pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). (Doc. 7.) Plaintiff filed a <u>motion for reconsideration on December</u> 27, 2010. (Doc. 9.) On December 30, 2010, the Magistrate Judge issued <u>findings and</u> recommendations recommending the motion for reconsideration be denied. (Doc. 10.) Plaintiff was given fifteen days within which to file objections, and an <u>objection</u> was filed on January 13, 2011. (Doc. 11.) The Court has considered Plaintiff's objections.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. The Court has

| 1        | considered Plaintiff's objections. Based on the evidence before the court, the court finds that |   |  |
|----------|---|---|--|
| 2        | Plaintiff has three strikes within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).                          |   |  |
| 3        | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:   |   |  |
| 4        | 1.  | The findings and recommendations, filed December 30, 2010, are adopted in full; |  |
| 5        |   | and   |  |
| 6        | 2.  | The motion for reconsideration, filed December 27, 2010, is denied.             |  |
| 7        |   |   |  |
| 8        | IT IS SO ORDERED.   |   |  |
| 9        | Dated: Jan  | uary 25, 2011 Athlii  |  |
| 10       | 2   | CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  |  |
| 11       |   |   |  |
| 12       |   |   |  |
| 13       |   |   |  |
| 14       |   |   |  |
| 15       |   |   |  |
| 16       |   |   |  |
| 17       |   |   |  |
| 18       |   |   |  |
| 19       |   |   |  |
| 20       |   |   |  |
| 21       |   |   |  |
| 22       |   |   |  |
| 23<br>24 |   |   |  |
| 24<br>25 |   |   |  |
| 25<br>26 |   |   |  |
| 20<br>27 |   |   |  |
| 27       |   |   |  |
| 20       |   |   |  |
|          |   | 2   |  |