| 1  |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 2  |   |  |
| 3  |   |  |
| 4  |   |  |
| 5  |   |  |
| 6  |   |  |
| 7  |   |  |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |  |
| 9  | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |  |
| 10 |   |  |
| 11 | GORDON BULLOCK,   | No. 1:14-cv-00092-DAD-EPG                            |
| 12 | Plaintiff,  |  |
| 13 | v.  | ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, DENYING |
| 14 | BROCK SHEELA, et al.,   | MOTION, AND REFERRING MATTER TO<br>MAGISTRATE JUDGE  |
| 15 | Defendants.   | (Doc. Nos. 80, 85)                                   |
| 16 |   | (Doc. Nos. 80, 83)                                   |
| 17 | Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights        |  |
| 18 | action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action now proceeds on plaintiff's fourth       |  |
| 19 | amended complaint against Brock Sheela and C. Rios. (Doc. No. 26.) The matter was referred to     |  |
| 20 | a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.         |  |
| 21 | On March 1, 2018, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations               |  |
| 22 | recommending that plaintiff's motion, which was styled as a motion for sanctions but sought an    |  |
| 23 | order compelling his transfer to a new facility and directing that a criminal investigation be    |  |
| 24 | conducted into what he alleged was his attempted murder, be denied. (Doc. Nos. 80, 85.) The       |  |
| 25 | parties were provided an opportunity to file objections to the findings and recommendations       |  |
| 26 | within twenty-one days. To date, neither party has filed objections and the time for doing so has |  |
| 27 | now passed.   |  |
| 28 | /////   |  |

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, the undersigned has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the undersigned concludes the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. Given the foregoing: 1. The findings and recommendations issued on March 1, 2018 (Doc. No. 85) are adopted in full; 2. Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief (Doc. No. 80) is denied; and 3. This case is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **April 3, 2018**