

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DANIEL MASTERSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
SUZANNE KILLEN et al.,
Defendants.

No. 1:11-cv-01179-DAD-SAB

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING
MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

(Doc. Nos. 85, 113)

Plaintiff Daniel Masterson is appearing *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this 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(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On October 19, 2016, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendation recommending that plaintiff’s motion for injunctive and other relief related to certain items of personal and legal property be denied, particularly because the motion is not related to plaintiff’s claims presented in this action. (Doc. No. 113.) The findings and recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice that objections thereto were to be filed within thirty days. More than thirty days have passed, and no objections to the findings and recommendations have been filed.

////

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

4 Accordingly,

- 5 1. The October 19, 2016 findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 113) are adopted in
6 full; and
- 7 2. Plaintiff's application for injunctive and other relief (Doc. No. 85) is denied.¹

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: January 6, 2017

10 
11 _____
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 ¹ The court notes that plaintiff has claimed that prison officials at CSATF confiscated and failed
25 to forward to plaintiff two boxes of legal and personal property that include documents which
26 plaintiff anticipates he will need to oppose any summary judgment motion filed in the future by
27 the defendants in this action. (Doc. No. 85.) Counsel for defendants are advised that if plaintiff's
28 forecast comes to fruition and he is able to make some showing of his need for those documents
to oppose summary judgment, the court will likely require defense counsel to inquire as to the
whereabouts and handling of plaintiff's property. It may be appropriate for defense counsel to do
so now in anticipation of such an order.