

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

DAVID ESTRADA,)	1:13cv00919 LJO DLB PC
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS
)	AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND
vs.)	DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
)	INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
TASSEY, et al.,)	
)	(Document 9)
Defendants.)	

Plaintiff David Estrada (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this this civil action. On June 20, 2013, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Injunctive Relief. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On July 8, 2013, the Magistrate Judge issued [Findings and Recommendations](#) that Plaintiff’s motion be denied. The Findings and Recommendations were served on Plaintiff and contained notice that any objections were to be filed within thirty days. Plaintiff filed [objections](#) on August 8, 2013.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including Plaintiff’s

1 objections, the Court finds that the Findings and Recommendations are supported by the record
2 and by proper analysis.

3 In the Findings and Recommendations, the Court found that Plaintiff was not entitled to
4 injunctive relief because there was no operative complaint, and because Plaintiff supported his
5 request with only vague, unsubstantiated claims. Plaintiff's objections fail to provide any
6 specific factual information.

7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 8
- 9 1. The Findings and Recommendations, filed July 8, 2013, are ADOPTED in full;
10 and
 - 11 2. Plaintiff's Motion for Injunctive Relief (Document 8) is DENIED.
- 12

13
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: August 27, 2013

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE