



1 On September 2, 2015, the Magistrate Judge issued [Findings and Recommendations](#) that  
2 Defendants' motion be granted. The Findings and Recommendations were served on the parties  
3 and contained notice that any objections were to be filed within thirty (30) days. Plaintiff filed  
4 [objections](#) on October 1, 2015, and Defendants filed a [reply](#) on October 8, 2015.<sup>1</sup>

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

9 Plaintiff's objections are simply a repeat of the arguments made in his opposition and  
10 addressed by the Magistrate Judge in the Findings and Recommendations. Although Plaintiff  
11 contends that the Magistrate Judge erred, recitation of his prior arguments does not establish  
12 grounds upon which to question the Magistrate Judge's analysis.

13 To the extent that Plaintiff faults the Magistrate Judge for indicating that he would not  
14 search the record for issues of material fact, this does not demonstrate that the Magistrate Judge's  
15 analysis was flawed. First, as the Magistrate Judge correctly noted, the Court does not have a  
16 duty to search the record for triable issues of material fact, even in actions involving pro se  
17 litigants. In re Oracle Corp. Securities Litigation, 627 F.3d 376, 386 (9th Cir. 2010). Second,  
18 the Magistrate Judge concluded that even if Plaintiff provided evidence of his safety concerns, it  
19 did not factor into the Court's decision.

20 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 21
- 22 1. The Findings and Recommendations, filed September 2, 2015, are ADOPTED in  
23 full;  
24

25 ///

26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> All documents related to the motion for summary judgment, including the Findings and Recommendations,  
28 Plaintiff's objections and Defendants' reply, are filed under seal. However, as this order does not discuss any  
sensitive information, it need not be sealed.

