

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

JESSE L. YOUNGBLOOD,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CLARK, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 1:15-cv-01746-DAD-BAM (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING  
MOTION

(Doc. Nos. 3, 11)

Plaintiff Jesse L. Youngblood is appearing *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff declined magistrate judge jurisdiction, and this matter was therefore referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On October 7, 2016, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that plaintiff's motion for injunctive and other relief, including seeking that a judgment be entered in his favor in this action, be denied. (Doc. No. 3.) The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen days.

On October 21, 2016, plaintiff filed timely objections to the findings and recommendations. (Doc. No. 12.) Plaintiff contends in his objections that he has suffered an injury and has not received proper medical treatment. He also declares that this action is not

1 brought by him for any improper purposes. Plaintiff's objections suggest that he has  
2 misunderstood the scope of the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations addressing his  
3 request for preliminary injunctive relief. The court wishes to make clear to plaintiff, although his  
4 motion for preliminary injunctive relief is being denied by this order, his case is not being  
5 dismissed at this time. As the magistrate judge indicated in the findings and recommendations,  
6 plaintiff's most recently filed amended complaint has not yet been screened by the court. It will  
7 be screened to determine whether it states any cognizable claim in due course.

8 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a  
9 *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including plaintiff's  
10 objections, the court finds the findings and recommendation to be supported by the record and by  
11 proper analysis.

12 Given the foregoing:

- 13 1. The findings and recommendations filed on October 7, 2016 (Doc. No. 11) are  
14 adopted in full; and
- 15 2. Plaintiff's application for injunctive and other relief (Doc. No. 3) is denied.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: November 2, 2016

18   
19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE