

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  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RASHEED HILSON, SR.  
  
                                Plaintiff,  
  
                                v.  
  
JESSE ARNETT,  
  
                                Defendant.

No. 1:15-cv-01240-DAD-MJS  
  
ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING  
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR LAW  
LIBRARY ACCESS  
  
(Doc. Nos. 51, 52.)

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302 of this court.

On September 11, 2017, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that plaintiff’s motion for prison law library access, construed as a motion for injunctive relief, be denied. (Doc. No. 52.) In the findings and recommendations the magistrate judge concluded that the court lacks personal jurisdiction to issue such an injunction. However, the magistrate judge also issued an order requesting assistance from the prison’s litigation coordinator with respect to the issue of plaintiff’s access to the law library. The findings and recommendation were served on all parties with notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen days. No objections to the findings and recommendations have been filed.

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

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings and recommendation to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

For these reasons:

1. The findings and recommendations filed on September 11, 2017 (Doc. No. 52) are adopted in full; and
2. Plaintiff's motion for law library access (Doc. No. 51), construed by the court as a motion for injunctive relief, is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 28, 2017

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE