

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ISABEL TUBACH,

Plaintiff,

v.

GUZMAN,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:12-cv-01241-AWI-SMS PC

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS TO DENY
PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS FOR PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

(Docs. 3, 6, 9, 11, 13)

Plaintiff, Isabel Tubach ("Plaintiff"), is a state prisoner who is currently proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed the Complaint on July 20, 2012. (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 72-302. Plaintiff's Complaint was dismissed with leave to amend for failure to state a cognizable claim for violation of her federal rights. (Doc. 12.)

Plaintiff has filed four motions for temporary restraining orders that are currently before the Court: (1) on July 20, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking a temporary restraining order against Defendant M. Guzman (Doc. 3, 1st TRO, pp. 2-3, 7); (2) on August 16, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting "a T.R.O." (Doc. 6, 2nd TRO, pg. 1); (3) on October 15, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting "a T.R.O. against Defendant M. Guzman" (Doc. 9, 3rd TRO, pg. 1); and (4) on January 9, 2013, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting "a temporary order to restraining the Defendant, C/O M. Guzman" (Doc. 11, 4th TRO, pg. 1).

On March 6, 2013, the Magistrate Judge filed a Findings and Recommendations herein which

1 was served on the parties and which contained notice that objections were to be filed within fifteen
2 days. Plaintiff did not file an objection.

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

6 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Findings and Recommendations, filed
7 March 6, 2013, is adopted in full and Plaintiff's motions for temporary restraining orders are denied
8 without prejudice.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: March 25, 2013



11 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28