

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
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANTHONY CEASAR HERNANDEZ,
Plaintiff,
v.
BALLAM, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No.: 1:17-cv-00468-LJO-BAM (PC)

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO LODGE
SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTATION IN
SUPPORT OF PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTION REQUEST
[ECF No. 28]

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS RECOMMENDING
DENIAL OF MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF
[ECF Nos. 24, 25]

Plaintiff Anthony Ceasar Hernandez is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. 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 February 7, 2018, Plaintiff filed a motion for an order to show cause for a preliminary injunction. (ECF No. 24.) On February 9, 2018, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that Plaintiff’s motion be denied, without prejudice. (ECF No. 25.) Those findings and recommendations were served on Plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. More than fourteen days have passed, and no objections have been filed. However, on February 20, 2018, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting to lodge supplemental documents in support of his motion. (ECF No. 28.)

1 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted
2 a de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court concludes that
3 the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper
4 analysis. Further, the Court finds that Plaintiff’s additional documentation does not undermine
5 the findings or analysis by the magistrate judge, and the Court declines to allow Plaintiff to
6 deposit this evidence on the docket. The Court is not a repository for evidence.

7 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

8 1. Plaintiff’s motion requesting to lodge supplemental documentation in support of
9 preliminary injunction request, filed on February 20, 2018 (ECF No. 28), is denied;

10 2. The findings and recommendations issued on February 9, 2017 (ECF No. 25), are
11 adopted in full; and

12 2. Plaintiff’s motion for an order to show cause for a preliminary injunction (ECF
13 No. 24), is denied, without prejudice.

14
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: March 6, 2018

/s/ Lawrence J. O’Neill
UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE