

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

DURRELL ANTHONY PUCKETT,

Plaintiff,

v.

VOGEL, et al.,

Defendants.

1:13-cv-00525-AWI-SKO (PC)

**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS TO DENY
PLAINTIFF’S MOTIONS FOR
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDERS**

(Docs. 81, 107, 114, 125)

Plaintiff, Durrell Anthony Puckett, is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* with a civil rights action 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. Plaintiff is proceeding in this action on claims against Defendants Sanchez, Vogel, and Johnson for retaliation in violation of the First Amendment; against Defendants Sanchez, Vogel, Johnson, Dean, Bolander, Abadia, Lockhart, Zamora, Sisneros, Campos, and Callow for excessive force in violation of the Eighth Amendment; and against Defendants Sanchez, Vogel, and Johnson for violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Plaintiff filed motions seeking temporary restraining orders and transfer from CSP-Corcoran to CSP-Sacramento. (Docs. 81, 107, 114.) On September 2, 2016, the Magistrate Judge issued a Findings and Recommendations to deny both motions. (Doc. 125.) The Findings and Recommendations was served on that same date and provided thirty days for the parties to

1 file objections. (*Id.*) Despite lapse of more than the allowed time, no objections were filed.¹

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

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 6 1. The Findings and Recommendations, issued on September 2, 2016 (Doc. 125), is
7 adopted in full; and
- 8 2. Plaintiff's motions for temporary restraining orders, filed on December 28, 2015 (Doc.
9 81), April 21, 2016 (Doc. 107), and May 16, 2016 (Doc. 114) are DENIED.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: September 21, 2016



12 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 ¹ It is noted that, since issuance of the Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff has been moved to CSP-Sacramento.