

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

MICHAEL ANTHONY TODD,
Plaintiff,
v.
D.J. RUIZ et al.,
Defendants.

No. 1:12-cv-01003-DAD-BAM

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR IMMEDIATE
RECOGNITION OF CREATIVITY AS A
RELIGION FOR FIRST AMENDMENT AND
RLUIPA PURPOSES

(Doc. Nos. 66, 84)

Plaintiff Michael Anthony Todd is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On September 1, 2017, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that plaintiff’s motion for immediate recognition of Creativity as a religion for purposes of the First Amendment and Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (“RLUIPA”) be denied. (Doc. No. 84.) Those findings and recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen days of service. (*Id.*) Plaintiff filed his objections on September 11, 2017. (Doc. No. 85.)

////

1 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), this court has conducted
2 a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including plaintiff's
3 objections, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and
4 by proper analysis. In his objections, plaintiff contends that the court has failed to perform
5 established tests to determine whether a belief or movement invokes constitutionally cognizable
6 religious interests. (Doc. No. 85 at 2.) Plaintiff has not identified any purported error in the
7 magistrate judge's analysis, and the court finds no basis to deviate from the findings and
8 recommendations.

9 Accordingly,

- 10 1. The September 1, 2017 findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 85) are adopted in
11 full;
- 12 2. Plaintiff's motion for the immediate recognition of Creativity as a religion for First
13 Amendment and RLUIPA purposes (Doc. No. 66) is denied; and
- 14 3. This matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings
15 consistent with this order.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: September 26, 2017

18 
19 _____
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE