

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

FRANCISCO SIERRA,
Plaintiff,
v.
J. CASTELLANOS,
Defendant.

No. 1:17-cv-01691-DAD-EPG (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

(Doc. Nos. 76, 77)

Plaintiff Francisco Sierra is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action filed 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 8, 2022, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, recommending that plaintiff’s motion for injunctive relief (Doc. No. 76) be denied because it was unrelated to the cruel-and-unusual punishment claim plaintiff has brought against defendant Castellanos, which is the only claim that is proceeding in this action. (Doc. No. 77.) Those findings and recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days after service. (*Id.* at 3.) On March 10, 2022, plaintiff filed objections. (Doc. No. 78.) To date, defendant has not filed a response to plaintiff’s objections.

////

1 In his motion for injunctive relief plaintiff complained about “RVR write ups” from James
2 Brown, who is apparently a corrections officer at Mule Creek State Prison, not a party to this case
3 and who does not appear to be in active concert with defendant Castellanos. (Doc. No. 76 at 2.)
4 Plaintiff’s objections to the findings and recommendations generally repeat and expand upon his
5 allegations that he is being targeted for harassment at his place of incarceration, but his objections
6 offer no substantive challenge to the findings and recommendations. (See Doc. No. 78.) Because
7 plaintiff’s motion (Doc. No. 76) and his subsequent objections (Doc. No. 78) do not address in
8 any way the cruel-and-unusual punishment claim which plaintiff has brought against defendant
9 Castellanos in this action, the court will adopt the findings and recommendations.

10 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a
11 *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including plaintiff’s
12 objections, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and
13 by proper analysis.

14 Accordingly,

- 15 1. The findings and recommendations issued on February 8, 2022 (Doc. No. 77) are
16 adopted in full; and
- 17 2. Plaintiff’s motion for injunctive relief (Doc. No. 76) is denied.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: April 8, 2022

20 
21 _____
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23
24
25
26
27
28