

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

AKHEEM DESHAVIER WILLIAMS,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
PATRICK JORDAN; LARRY LEEDS,  
JONATHAN RIVERA; and STEVEN  
SITTER,  
Defendants.

No. 1:17-cv-00816-DAD-BAM

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING FOR  
FAILURE TO OBEY COURT ORDERS

(Doc. No. 59)

Plaintiff Akheem Deshavier Williams is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action 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 July 18, 2019, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, recommending that this action be dismissed with prejudice due to plaintiff’s failure to obey the court’s previously issued orders (Doc. Nos. 31, 41) to file a single, complete amended complaint instead of filing multiple, piecemeal amendments that obstruct the court’s ability to screen his complaint. (Doc. No. 55.) The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto must be filed within fourteen (14) days after service of the order. (*Id.* at 8.) After plaintiff was granted an extension of time to file his objections (Doc. No. 57), he timely filed objections on August 14, 2019. (Doc. No. 58.)

1 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a  
2 *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including plaintiff's  
3 objections, the court finds the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by  
4 proper analysis.

5 In his objections, plaintiff states that he was aware that the court had instructed him not to  
6 make piecemeal filings but misunderstood the meaning of that directive. (Doc. No. 58.) Plaintiff  
7 further asserts that the court does not want to assist him and never responded to his complaint.  
8 (*Id.*) However, the magistrate judge's orders directing plaintiff to file a single amended  
9 complaint contained very clear instructions to plaintiff to file a single amended complaint and  
10 explicitly explained why his repeated filings were impeding the court's ability to screen his  
11 complaint. (Doc. Nos. 31, 41.) The remainder of plaintiff's lengthy objections do not address the  
12 merits of the findings and recommendations. Instead, those objections further contravene the  
13 court's orders by speculating opaquely about the occurrence of harmful physical and mental  
14 phenomena and include numerous exhibits of purported evidence and allegations that appear  
15 designed to supplement plaintiff's complaint. (Doc. No. 58, Exs. 1-5A.)

16 Accordingly,

- 17 1. The findings and recommendations issued on July 18, 2019 (Doc. No. 55) are adopted  
18 in full;
- 19 2. This case is dismissed with prejudice due to plaintiff's failure to obey court orders;  
20 and
- 21 3. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.

22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: October 22, 2019

24   
25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
27  
28