

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

REGINALD A. GARY,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
KINCAID, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 1:18-cv-00612-LJO-BAM (PC)  
**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING  
DENIAL OF MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY  
INJUNCTION**  
(ECF No. 15)

Plaintiff Reginald A. Gary (“Plaintiff”) is a civil detainee proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action 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 August 9, 2018, Plaintiff filed a motion for a preliminary injunction, seeking a restraining order against Coalinga State Hospital staff to prevent them from reading, searching, or otherwise taking or copying Plaintiff’s legal documents, without his presence and awareness. Plaintiff argued that the injunction is necessary because he is in active litigation against Coalinga. (ECF No. 14.) Plaintiff also filed a motion to appoint counsel on the same date. (ECF No. 13.)

On August 14, 2018, the assigned Magistrate Judge issued an order denying Plaintiff’s motion to appoint counsel, without prejudice, as well as findings and recommendations recommending denial of the motion for preliminary injunction. (ECF No. 15.)

///

1 On August 27, 2018, Plaintiff filed a “Motion for Objection Denying the  
2 Recommendation for Preliminary Injunction Against Defendants at Coalinga State Hospital for an  
3 Restraining Order.” (ECF No. 16.) In his objections, Plaintiff merely states that he objects to the  
4 Magistrate Judge’s recommendation to deny the motion for preliminary injunction, as well as the  
5 denial of his motion for counsel.

6 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a  
7 *de novo* review of the case. Plaintiff’s objections fail to provide a legal basis on which to  
8 question the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendations. Having carefully reviewed the  
9 entire file, the Court concludes that the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendations are  
10 supported by the record and by proper analysis.

11 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 12 1. The findings and recommendations issued on August 14, 2018, (ECF No. 15), are adopted  
13 in full;
- 14 2. Plaintiff’s motion for injunctive relief, (ECF No. 14), is denied; and
- 15 3. The matter is referred back to the assigned Magistrate Judge for further proceedings  
16 consistent with this order.

17  
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: August 28, 2018

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