| 1  |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2  |  |  |  |
| 3  |  |  |  |
| 4  |  |  |  |
| 5  |  |  |  |
| 6  |  |  |  |
| 7  |  |  |  |
| 8  | UNITED STAT  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT                       |  |
| 9  | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |
| 11 | WILLIAM GRADFORD,  | No. 1:17-cv-01248-DAD-GSA                          |  |
| 12 | Plaintiff,   |  |  |
| 13 | V.   | ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND                        |  |
| 14 | STANISLAUS PUBLIC SAFETY   | RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR |  |
| 15 | CENTER, et al.,  | PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF                      |  |
| 16 | Defendants.  | (Doc. Nos. 6, 11)                                  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  |
| 18 | Plaintiff William J. Gradford is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis            |  |  |
| 19 | with this civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a     |  |  |
| 20 | United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.              |  |  |
| 21 | On October 16, 2017, plaintiff filed a notice with the court stating his concerns about              |  |  |
| 22 | officers at Deuel Vocational Institution. (Doc. No. 6.) On March 30, 2018, the assigned              |  |  |
| 23 | magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, construing plaintiff's notice as a motion      |  |  |
| 24 | for preliminary injunctive relief and recommending that plaintiff's motion for such preliminary      |  |  |
| 25 | relief be denied. (Doc. No. 11.) The findings and recommendations were served on the parties         |  |  |
| 26 | and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen days after         |  |  |
| 27 | service. (Id. at 2.) On April 13, 2018, plaintiff filed a notice to the court stating that he had no |  |  |

objections to those findings and recommendations. (Doc. No. 12.)

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, this court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis. For these reasons, 1. The findings and recommendations issued March 30, 2018 (Doc. No. 11) are adopted in full; 2. Plaintiff's notice (Doc. No. 6), construed as a motion for a preliminary injunction, is denied; and 3. This matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings. IT IS SO ORDERED. May 2, 2018 Dated: