

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.  
  
B. SEITZ, et al.,  
  
Defendants.

No. 1:18-cv-00766-AWI-SKO (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING  
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION  
  
(Docs. 20, 28)

Plaintiff Christopher Lipsey, Jr., is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action. 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 21, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, recommending that Plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction (Doc. 20) be denied. (Doc. 28.) The magistrate judge found that Plaintiff failed to show that he is likely to succeed on the merits or that he will suffer irreparable harm without the requested relief. (*Id.* at 2). The magistrate judge further found that Plaintiff’s requested relief is unrelated the claims in his complaint. (*Id.* at 3). The findings and recommendations were served on Plaintiff and provided him 21 days to file objections thereto. (*Id.*) Plaintiff has not filed any objections and the time to do so has passed.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> On March 3, 2020, Plaintiff filed a document titled, “Emergency Preliminary Injunction/Temporary Restraining Order Request.” (Doc. 30.) Although Plaintiff references the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations, his requested relief is different from the requested relief in his previous motion (Doc. 20). Therefore, the magistrate

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

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

Accordingly, the Court ORDERS:

1. The findings and recommendations filed on February 21, 2020 (Doc. 28) are ADOPTED in full;
2. Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction (Doc. 20) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 30, 2020

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE

\_\_\_\_\_  
judge construed the filing (Doc. 30) as a new motion for a preliminary injunction. (Doc. 35 at 2.)