

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

BILLY COY COCHRAN,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
S. SHERMAN, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 1:15-cv-01388-DAD-BAM  
ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING  
VARIOUS MOTIONS  
(Doc. Nos. 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 44)

Plaintiff Billy Cochran is appearing *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case is proceeding on plaintiff’s first amended complaint against defendants S. Sherman and J. Barba for the alleged violation of plaintiff’s First Amendment rights based upon the denial of his requested name change for religious purposes. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On July 24, 2017, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations (Doc. No. 44) recommending that: (1) plaintiff’s motion for a copy of the case file, filed on October 12, 2016 (Doc. No. 16), be denied; (2) defendants’ motion to dismiss, filed on November 9, 2016 (Doc. No. 19), be denied as moot; (3) plaintiff’s motions to defer a ruling and to permit discovery, filed on November 22, 2016 (Doc. No. 20), and March 8, 2017 (Doc. No. 27), be denied as moot; (4) plaintiff’s motion requesting documents, filed on November 22, 2016 (Doc.

1 No. 21), be denied as moot; and (5) plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, filed on February  
2 6, 2017 (Doc No. 22), be denied as premature.

3 The parties were provided an opportunity to file objections to the findings and  
4 recommendations within 30 days. (Doc. No. 44.) The 30-day time period has expired and, to  
5 date, neither party has filed objections.

6 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, the  
7 undersigned has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully considered the entire  
8 file, the undersigned concludes the findings and recommendations are supported by the record  
9 and proper analysis.

10 Given the foregoing:

- 11 1. The findings and recommendations issued on July 24, 2017 (Doc. No. 44) are adopted  
12 in full;
- 13 2. Plaintiff's motion for a copy of the case file (Doc. No. 16) is denied;
- 14 3. Defendants' motion to dismiss (Doc. No. 19) is denied;
- 15 4. Plaintiff's motion to defer a ruling and permit discovery (Doc. Nos. 20, 27) is denied;
- 16 5. Plaintiff's motion requesting documents (Doc. No. 21) is denied; and
- 17 6. Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Doc. No. 22) is denied.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: August 30, 2017

20   
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28