

1 or any other suit, Plaintiff's continuing belief that all of Plaintiff's current and prior litigation
2 should be consolidated, or requests for sanctions against attorneys, those arguments have been
3 repeatedly dismissed by the Court. (See Docs. 8, 62, 63; see also Doc. 64 at 9, n.4.) Plaintiff's
4 remaining arguments regarding the motion for summary judgment at issue, that his administrative
5 remedies were unavailable due to alleged due process violations at his disciplinary hearing for the
6 September 9, 2013 incident, are not relevant to the issue of whether Plaintiff exhausted his
7 administrative remedies for Plaintiff's excessive force claim for the events of September 9, 2013.

8 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a
9 *de novo* review of this case, including Plaintiff's objections. Having carefully reviewed the entire
10 file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by
11 proper analysis. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS**:

- 12 1. The findings and recommendations issued on February 7, 2024, (Doc. 64), are
13 **ADOPTED IN FULL.**
- 14 2. Plaintiff's motion for law library access, (Doc. 46), is **DENIED.**
- 15 3. Defendant's motion for summary judgment for failure to exhaust, (Doc. 37), is
16 **GRANTED.**
- 17 4. This action is dismissed, without prejudice, for failure to exhaust administrative
18 remedies.
- 19 5. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.

20
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: April 17, 2024

23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE