

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

MARK HUNT,  
  
                                  Plaintiff,  
  
          v.  
  
D. DIAZ, et al.,  
  
                                  Defendants.

No. 1:19-cv-00504-DAD-SAB (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATIONS

(Doc. No. 53, 56)

Plaintiff Mark Hunt is a prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* with 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 September 18, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that the “notice” plaintiff filed on August 10, 2020 (Doc. No. 53), which the magistrate judge construed as a request for a temporary restraining order, be denied because the court lacks jurisdiction over the prison officials that plaintiff is seeking to enjoin since those particular officials are not named as defendants in this action. (Doc. No. 56.) Those findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days from the date of service. (*Id.* at 3.) To date, no objections to the pending findings and recommendations have been filed with the

1 court, and the time for doing so has expired.<sup>1</sup>

2 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the undersigned has  
3 conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the  
4 undersigned concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and  
5 proper analysis.

6 Accordingly,

- 7 1. The findings and recommendations issued on September 18, 2020 (Doc. No. 56)  
8 are adopted in full;
- 9 2. Plaintiff's request for a temporary restraining order (Doc. No. 53) is denied; and
- 10 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to correct the docket entry for Document No. 58 by  
11 modifying the title to state: "Objections to [52] Motion to Stay."

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: October 26, 2020

14   
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>1</sup> The court notes that on October 19, 2020, plaintiff filed a notice with a caption stating:  
26 "Objection to the stay of action on defendant's request." (Doc. No. 58.) This filing was docketed  
27 with the title "Objections to Findings and Recommendations [Doc. No.] 56," but the undersigned  
28 has reviewed this filing and determined that it does not contain any objections to the pending  
findings and recommendations. Instead, this filing reflects plaintiff's objections to defendants'  
motion to stay this action (Doc. No. 52). Accordingly, the court will direct the Clerk of Court to  
correct the docket entry for Document No. 58 by modifying it to reflect: "Objections to [52]  
Motion to Stay."