

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

LACEDRIC W. JOHNSON,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
J. BEJINEZ, et al.,  
Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:14-cv-01601-LJO-BMK  
**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS TO DENY MOTION  
FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**  
**(ECF No. 47 & 43)**

Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 26, 2016, Plaintiff filed a motion for judicial intervention requesting, among other things, that an order issue directing Defendants to cease and desist “unethical conduct” and admonishing prison officials to “better regulate their legal mail.” (ECF NO. 43.) The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 302 of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California.

On April 19, 2016, the Magistrate Judge issued Findings and Recommendations (F&Rs), construing Plaintiff’s February 26, 2016 request as a motion for injunctive relief

1 and recommending that the motion be denied. (ECF No. 47.)<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff was given thirty  
2 (30) days to file objections to the F&Rs. (*Id.*) Plaintiff failed to file objections.

3 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has  
4 conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the  
5 Court finds the F&Rs to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

6 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 7 1. The Court adopts in full the F&Rs filed April 19, 2016 (ECF No. 47);
- 8 2. Plaintiff's February 26, 2016 request (ECF No. 43), construed as a motion  
9 for preliminary injunction, is DENIED; and
- 10 3. The matter is referred back to the magistrate judge.

11  
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: December 16, 2016

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

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>1</sup> Also included in Plaintiff's February 26, 2016 request was a request to late-file an opposition to  
28 Defendants motion for summary judgment. The Magistrate Judge addressed the timeliness of Plaintiff's  
opposition filing in the context of an Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Defendants' motion to  
strike. (See ECF No. 46.) Defendants' opposition was deemed timely filed, so his request to late file is  
moot.