

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.)	STRIKING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
)	SANCTIONS
GIPSON, et al.,)	(Document 66)
)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiff David Estrada (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma Pauperis in this this civil action. Plaintiff filed his First Amended Complaint on August 7, 2013. This action is proceeding against (1) Defendants Gipson and Espinosa for retaliation in violation of the First Amendment; and (2) Defendants Gipson, Espinosa, Lambert and Cavazos for violation of the Eighth Amendment.

On January 21, 2014, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Sanctions, which the Court interpreted as 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 February 14, 2014, the Magistrate Judge issued [Findings and Recommendations](#) that Plaintiff’s motion be stricken. The Findings and Recommendations were served on Plaintiff and

1 contained notice that any objections were to be filed within thirty days. Plaintiff filed [objections](#)
2 on March 21, 2014.

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

7
8 In his objections, Plaintiff states that he wants the Court's order sealing the complaint to
9 be respected "by all of those [he] must come across." Obj. 2. Plaintiff's failure to abide by the
10 Court's prohibition against further motions attempting to remedy issues over which the Court
11 does not have jurisdiction was addressed thoroughly by the Findings and Recommendations, and
12 his objections only underscore the Court's findings.

13 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 14 1. The Findings and Recommendations, filed February 14, 2014, are ADOPTED in
15 full;
- 16 2. Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions (Document 62) is STRICKEN.

17
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: March 25, 2014

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