



1 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the undersigned has  
2 conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the  
3 undersigned concludes the findings and recommendation are supported by the record and by  
4 proper analysis. Plaintiff's objections do not persuade the court otherwise. The mere fact that  
5 plaintiff keeps "getting copies not quit[e] right" because he is not allowed to use a photocopier  
6 does not warrant a preliminary injunction on the basis of plaintiff's claim that he is being denied  
7 access to the courts.

8 Based on the foregoing,

- 9 1. The January 24, 2017 findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 66) are adopted in full;  
10 and  
11 2. Plaintiff's motion for access to photocopy services (Doc. No. 65) is denied.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: April 27, 2017

14   
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28