

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JON CHRIST,

CASE NO. 1:11-cv-00705-AWI-GBC (PC)

Plaintiff,

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATION DENYING  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF

v.

JAMES HARTLEY,

Defendant.

(ECF No. 12)

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Jon Christ ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

This action is proceeding on Plaintiff's Complaint, which has not yet been screened by this Court. (ECF No. 1.)

On May 12, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking a preliminary injunction. (ECF No. 9.) In that Motion, Plaintiff stated that, on April 15, 2011, he was informed by prison staff that all electronic appliances were going to be taken from inmates. Plaintiff requested an injunction to stop that from happening.

1 The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C.  
2 § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On September 2, 2011, the Magistrate Judge filed a  
3 Findings and Recommendation recommending that Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary  
4 Injunction be denied. (ECF No. 12.) The Magistrate Judge found that Plaintiff failed to  
5 meet the legal prerequisites for injunctive relief.<sup>1</sup> No objections were filed.  
6

7 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has  
8 conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the  
9 Court finds the Findings and Recommendation to be supported by the record and by  
10 proper analysis.  
11

12 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 13 1. The Findings and Recommendation, filed September 2, 2011, is ADOPTED;  
14 and  
15 2. Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction is DENIED.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: October 12, 2011

18   
19 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 <sup>1</sup> "A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the  
26 merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of  
27 equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest." Am. Trucking Ass'ns, Inc. v. City  
of Los Angeles, 559 F.3d 1046, 1052 (9th Cir. 2009) (quoting Winter v. Natural Res. Defense Council,  
129 S.Ct. 365, 374 (2008)).