

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

JOHN E. MITCHELL,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CRM M.S. ROBICHEAUX,  
Defendant.

No. 1:16-cv-01148-DAD-EPG (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING  
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF UNDER THE ALL WRITS ACT

(Doc. Nos. 156, 169)

Plaintiff John E. Mitchell is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* with this civil rights action filed 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.

On June 9, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, recommending that plaintiff’s motion for injunctive relief under the All Writs Act be denied without prejudice. (Doc. No. 169 at 3.) The findings and recommendations were served on both parties and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within twenty-one (21) days of service. (*Id.*) No objections have been filed, and the time to do so has now passed.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, the court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the

////


1 court concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and proper  
2 analysis.

3 Accordingly:

- 4 1. The findings and recommendations issued on June 9, 2020 (Doc. No. 169) are  
5 adopted in full; and
- 6 2. Plaintiff's motion for an order under the All Writs Act (Doc. No. 159) is denied  
7 without prejudice.<sup>1</sup>

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: August 3, 2020

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 <sup>1</sup> As the magistrate judge noted, if plaintiff requires an extension of any deadline due to lack of  
27 access to his legal property or the law library, he may file a motion seeking an extension of time.  
28 (Doc. No. 169 at 3.) Additionally, if this case proceeds to trial and plaintiff still believes he is  
being denied adequate access to his legal property or the law library, plaintiff may renew this  
motion for injunctive relief. (*Id.*)