

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

DAVID W. WILSON,  
  
                                Plaintiff,  
  
                                v.  
  
CALIFORNIA STATE PRISON  
CORCORAN, et al.,  
  
                                Defendants.

No. 1:18-cv-00424-DAD-JDP

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING  
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF

(Doc. No. 12)

Plaintiff David W. Wilson is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* in this civil rights action brought 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 26, 2018, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that plaintiff’s motion for injunctive relief be denied. (Doc. No. 12.) On August 9, 2018, plaintiff filed objections to those findings and recommendations. (Doc. No. 14.)

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this court has conducted a *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including plaintiff’s objections, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.

////

1 Plaintiff's objections, like his complaint, are difficult to decipher. However, it appears  
2 that plaintiff's main objection to the pending findings and recommendations is based upon his  
3 contention that the facilities and accommodations at his institution of confinement are deficient.  
4 (See Doc. No. 14 at 1-8.). However, this objection does not address the substance of the  
5 magistrate judge's findings and recommendations, which found that: (1) plaintiff's motion for  
6 permanent injunctive relief is premature given that a final hearing on the merits of plaintiff's  
7 claims has not taken place; (2) plaintiff's motion for a temporary injunctive relief should be  
8 denied because plaintiff has not established that he is likely to succeed on the merits of his claims;  
9 and (3), most importantly, plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief, which alleges various  
10 deficiencies with the prison's facilities and procedures, is unrelated to the allegations in his  
11 complaint in which he alleges that he was retaliated against and deprived of medical treatment.  
12 (Doc. No. 12 at 2-3.) None of plaintiff's objections even attempt to respond to these findings.

13 Accordingly,

- 14 1. The findings and recommendations issued on July 26, 2018 (Doc. No. 12) are  
15 adopted in full;
- 16 2. Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief (Doc. No. 11) is denied; and
- 17 3. The matter is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further  
18 proceedings consistent with this order.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: November 27, 2018

21   
22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28