

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

RODERICK WILLIAM LEAR,

Plaintiff,

v.

CORCORAN STATE PRISON, and
YASSER MANSOUR,

Defendants.

No. 1:17-cv-00071-DAD-JDP

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF

(Doc. Nos. 42, 43)

Plaintiff Roderick William Lear 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.

On February 20, 2018, plaintiff filed a motion requesting that he be released from the infirmary at his current institution of confinement so that he could receive his legal property and have access to the law library. (Doc. No. 42.) On April 11, 2018, the then-assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, construing plaintiff’s motion as a request for injunctive relief and recommending that the motion be denied. (Doc. No. 43.)¹ The findings and

¹ Nonetheless, the magistrate judge did request that the litigation coordinator at plaintiff’s institution of confinement assist plaintiff to ensure he received adequate opportunities to access his legal materials and the law library. (Doc. No. 43 at 2.)

1 recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were
2 to be filed within fourteen days after service. To date, plaintiff has filed no objections to the
3 findings and recommendations, and the time in which to file objections has now passed.

4 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, this
5 court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the
6 court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.

7 For these reasons,

- 8 1. The findings and recommendations issued February 22, 2018 (Doc. No. 43) are
9 adopted in full;
- 10 2. Plaintiff's motion (Doc. No. 42), construed as a motion for injunctive relief, is
11 denied; and
- 12 3. This matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further
13 proceedings.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: July 18, 2018

16 
17 _____
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28