

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

WILLIAM J. GRADFORD,
Plaintiff,
v.
MCDOUGALL, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 1:17-cv-00201-DAD-GSA

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS FOR
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

(Doc. Nos. 26, 27, 28, 31)

Plaintiff William J. Gradford is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* with 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 9, 2018, plaintiff filed a request that the U.S. District Court monitor his safety and wellbeing. (Doc. No. 26.) On February 22, 2018, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, construing plaintiff's request as a motion for a preliminary injunction and recommending that plaintiff's motion for the requested preliminary relief be denied. (Doc. No. 27.) The findings and recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen days after service. (*Id.* at 3.) On March 8, 2018, plaintiff filed a notice with the court stating that he had no objections to the findings and recommendations. (Doc. No. 30.)

1 On March 1, 2018, plaintiff filed a motion seeking a court order “to stop the unlawful
2 conduct” of defendants towards plaintiff. (Doc. No. 28.) On March 19, 2018, the assigned
3 magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, again construing plaintiff’s motion as a
4 motion for a preliminary injunction and recommending that the motion for preliminary relief be
5 denied. (Doc. No. 31.) Those findings and recommendations were served on the parties and
6 contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen days after service.
7 (*Id.* at 3.) On March 27, 2018, plaintiff again filed a notice with the court stating that he had no
8 objections to the recommended denial of his motion. (Doc. No. 35.)

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

12 For these reasons,

- 13 1. The findings and recommendations issued February 22, 2018 (Doc. No. 27) are
14 adopted in full;
- 15 2. Plaintiff’s request filed February 9, 2018 (Doc. No. 26), construed as a motion for
16 preliminary injunctive relief, is denied;
- 17 3. The findings and recommendations issued March 19, 2018 (Doc. No. 31) are
18 adopted in full;
- 19 4. Plaintiff’s motion filed March 1, 2018 (Doc. No. 28), construed as a motion for
20 preliminary injunctive relief, is denied; and
- 21 5. This matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further
22 proceedings.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: May 2, 2018

25 
26 _____
27 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
28