

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**

ANTHONY SHARP,	)	Case No.: 1:13-cv-00534-AWI-BAM PC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
	)	RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING DENIAL
v.	)	OF MOTION FOR COURT ORDER
	)	
MARGARET MIMS,	)	
	)	(ECF Nos. 8, 9)
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff Anthony Sharp (“Plaintiff”), a prisoner in the Fresno County Jail, is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to [42 U.S.C. § 1983](#). Plaintiff filed his complaint on April 15, 2013. Thereafter, on May 1, 2013, Plaintiff a motion requesting a court order for law library access. In relevant part, Plaintiff sought an order directing Fresno County Jail officials to allow him access to legal books and a copier if needed to prosecute this civil action. (ECF No. 8.)

On May 10, 2013, the Magistrate Judge issued findings and recommendations that Plaintiff’s motion for a court order directing access to the law library be denied. (ECF No. 9.) The findings and recommendations were served on Plaintiff and contained notice that any objections were to be filed within thirty days. On May 20, 2013, Plaintiff filed objections to the findings and recommendations. (ECF No. 14.)

In his objections, Plaintiff contends that he should have access to the law library and law books regardless of whether he is proceeding in a civil or a criminal action. Plaintiff complains that he

1 cannot adequately prosecute this action without such access. As noted by the Magistrate Judge,  
2 Plaintiff's complaint has not been screened pursuant to [28 U.S.C. § 1915A\(a\)](#), and there are no  
3 pending deadlines that require access to the law library. Further, Plaintiff's objections do not address  
4 the underlying determination by the Magistrate Judge that the issue Plaintiff seeks to remedy in his  
5 motion bears no relation to his claims of deliberate indifference and that this action provides no basis  
6 upon which to award him injunctive relief. (ECF No. 9, p. 2.)

7 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a de  
8 novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including Plaintiff's objections,  
9 the Court finds the Findings and Recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper  
10 analysis.

11 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 12 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on May 10, 2013 are adopted in full; and
- 13 2. Plaintiff's motion for court order directing access to the law library is DENIED.

14  
15  
16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: May 28, 2013

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
18 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE