

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

CHRISTOPHER LIPSEY, JR.,
Plaintiff,
v.
MEDINA, et al.,
Defendants.

1:17-cv-01705-LJO-MJS (PC)
**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS TO DENY REQUEST
FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**
(ECF No. 11)

Plaintiff 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 February 5, 2018, Plaintiff filed a motion for preliminary injunctive relief. (ECF No. 9.) Plaintiff moves the Court to direct the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (“CDCR”): (1) To provide Plaintiff and all other prisoners with their property upon arrival during a transfer; (2) To not retaliate against Plaintiff for seeking the injunction; (3) To use cameras to record property transfers; and (4) To photograph prisoners with their property when they receive it following transfer. (*Id.* at 8.) Because the matter has yet to be screened and Defendants have not been served, no opposition was filed.

On February 15, 2018, the Magistrate Judge filed findings and recommendations to deny the motion. (ECF No. 11.) The Magistrate Judge reasoned that Plaintiff has not

1 shown a likelihood of success on the merits, irreparable harm, a balance of the equities
2 in his favor, or that an injunction is in the public interest. (Id.) Plaintiff was given fourteen
3 days to file objections. (Id.) On March 2, 2018, Plaintiff filed objections. (ECF No. 13.)
4 Plaintiff's objections reiterate the arguments in the original motion and he sets forth no
5 new arguments or facts. (Id.)

6 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304,
7 the Court has conducted a de novo review of Plaintiff's request. The Court finds the
8 findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.
9 Plaintiff has made no showing that he is entitled to injunctive relief at this time. The Court
10 will deny his request, albeit without prejudice. If new circumstances arise in the future
11 that warrant consideration, Plaintiff may renew his request at that time.

12 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 13 1. The findings and recommendations filed on February 15, 2018 (ECF No.
14 11) are adopted in full; and
- 15 2. Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief (ECF No. 9) is DENIED without
16 prejudice.

17
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: March 23, 2018

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