

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

DALE OWEN DUSTIN,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

GIPSON, et al.,

 Defendants.

Case No. 1:14-cv-00757 AWI DLB PC

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING
PLAINTIFF’S REQUESTS FOR INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF

(Document 27)

Plaintiff Dale Owen Dustin (“Plaintiff”) is a California state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On June 11, 2014, Plaintiff filed numerous motions in which he requests injunctive relief. The matters were referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On June 19, 2014, the Magistrate Judge issued [Findings and Recommendations](#) that Plaintiff’s motions be denied. The Findings and Recommendations were served on Plaintiff and contained notice that any objections to the Findings and Recommendations were to be filed within thirty (30) days. On July 21, 2014, Plaintiff filed [objections](#). On July 25, 2014, Plaintiff filed a “[supplement](#)” to his objections.

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

1 analysis.

2 Plaintiff's complaint has been dismissed with leave to amend, and his date for amending has
3 not yet passed. In the order dismissing the complaint, the Court explained that his complaint was
4 virtually illegible due to Plaintiff's very small handwriting, and his failure to leave sufficient space
5 between his words and between the lines of his writing. Plaintiff was referred to Local Rule 130(b),
6 which requires that filings be "clearly legible."

7 Plaintiff's objections are written in the same manner as his original complaint, despite the
8 Court's prior admonition. His objections are very difficult to comprehend, though it does not appear
9 that he presents clear, logical arguments that require further discussion.

10 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 11 1. The Findings and Recommendations, filed June 19, 2014, are ADOPTED in full;
- 12 and
- 13 2. Plaintiff's motions for injunctive relief (Document 24-2) are DENIED.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: August 13, 2014

16 
17 _____
18 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE