

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
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES EDWARD BOWELL,

Plaintiff,

v.

A. DIAZ, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:11-cv-01350-AWI-MJS (PC)

**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS DENYING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EMERGENCY
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(ECF Nos. 28, 32)

Plaintiff James Edward Bowell is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action filed August 15, 2011 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302 of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California.

On October 31, 2013, the Magistrate Judge issued findings and recommendations (ECF No. 32) that Plaintiff's motion for emergency injunctive relief (ECF No. 28) be denied without prejudice. On November 12, 2013, Plaintiff filed objections to the findings and recommendations. (ECF No. 33.)

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has

1 conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court
2 finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper
3 analysis.

4 The objections re-hash arguments previously considered and rejected by the
5 Magistrate in the findings and recommendations, that High Desert State Prison ("HDSP")
6 staff conspired and retaliated against Plaintiff, mishandled his legal mail and grievances
7 and denied access to the law library and courts. This, according to Plaintiff, prevented
8 authoritative response to the findings and recommendations. It remains that these re-
9 arguments, which relate to allegations and individuals not before the Court in this action,
10 are not a basis for objection for the reasons noted by the Magistrate. Plaintiff does not
11 identify any portion of the findings and recommendations with which he disagrees or any
12 factual or legal error or any issues requiring legal research.

13 Plaintiff's objections do not raise an issue of law or fact under the findings and
14 recommendations and lack merit on that basis.

15 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 16 1. The Court adopts the findings and recommendations filed on October 31,
17 2013 (ECF No. 32) in full, and
- 18 2. Plaintiff's motion for emergency injunctive relief (ECF No. 28) is DENIED
19 without prejudice.

20
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: November 20, 2013


23 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

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