

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

JONATHAN GRIGSBY,  
  
                    Plaintiff,  
  
          v.  
  
C. PFEIFFER, et al.,  
  
                    Defendants.

**Case No. 1:17-cv-01384-DAD-JLT (PC)**  
  
**ORDER DENYING MOTION SEEKING  
RESPONSE**  
  
**(ECF No. 19)**

This case was closed on February 7, 2018, after the previously-assigned magistrate judge recommended that this civil rights action be dismissed without prejudice to plaintiff filing a petition for writ of habeas corpus. Plaintiff sought reconsideration of the dismissal order, and on July 26, 2018, the undersigned recommended that this action be reopened to allow plaintiff to proceed on a single retaliation claim. Following receipt of plaintiff’s August 6, 2018, objections, the Honorable Dale A. Drozd adopted the findings and recommendations in full on August 30, 2018, and directed plaintiff to file an amended complaint within 28 days.

Pending now is plaintiff’s “Motion Seeking Response to August 6, 2018, F&R.” (ECF No. 19.) A review of this motion reveals that plaintiff is in fact seeking consideration of his August 6, 2018, objections to the findings and recommendations. Those objections, however, have already been considered by Judge Drozd, who found that “Plaintiff presents no new arguments or allegations that provide a legal basis on which to question the magistrate judge’s

1 findings and recommendations.” (ECF No. 18 at 2.) Accordingly, plaintiff’s motion seeking  
2 response (ECF No. 19) is **DENIED**.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: September 25, 2018

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
5 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28