| 1 | | |
|--------|--|--|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | GREGORY ELL SHEHEE, | No. 1:14-cv-00706-DAD-SAB |
| 12 | Plaintiff, | |
| 13 | v. | ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND |
| 14 | REDDING and BLANCO, | RECOMMENDATIONS, DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS FOR INJUNCTIVE |
| 15 | Defendants. | $\frac{\text{RELIEF}}{(D_{1}, N_{1}, 5)} = 50.50.50$ |
| 16 | | (Doc. Nos. 58, 59, 60) |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | At the time this action was filed, plaintiff Gregory Ell Shehee was a civil detainee | |
| 20 | proceeding pro se in a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Individuals detained | |
| 21 | pursuant to California Welfare and Institutions Code § 6600 et seq. are civil detainees and are not | |
| 22 | prisoners within the meaning of the Prison Litigation Reform Act. Page v. Torrey, 201 F.3d | |
| 23 | 1136, 1140 (9th Cir. 2000). | |
| 24 | The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. | |
| 25 | § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On December 1, 2016, the assigned magistrate judge filed | |
| 26 | findings and recommendations, recommending that the court deny plaintiff's motions for access | |
| 27 | to copy services. (Doc. No. 60.) The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and | |
| 28 | contained notice that objections thereto were to be filed within thirty days. (<i>Id.</i>) Plaintiff filed 1 | |

| 1 | objections on December 13, 2016. (Doc. No. 61.) | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a | |
| 3 | de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including plaintiff's | |
| 4 | objections, the court finds the findings and recommendation to be supported by the record and by | |
| 5 | proper analysis. | |
| 6 | Based on the foregoing, | |
| 7 | 1. The December 1, 2016 findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 60) are adopted in | |
| 8 | full; | |
| 9 | 2. Plaintiff's motions for access to copy services (Doc. Nos. 58, 59) are denied; and | |
| 10 | 3. This matter is referred to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings | |
| 11 | consistent with this order. | |
| 12 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 13 | Dated: February 14, 2017 Dale A. Drod | |
| 14 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | 2 | |
| | | |