1		
2 3		
3		
4 5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	RICARDO MARTINEZ,	No. 1:19-cv-01768-DAD-SAB (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
14	C. PFEIFFER, et al.,	RECOMMENDATIONS AND DISMISSING CASE AS DUPLICATIVE
15	Defendants.	(Doc. No. 13, 20)
16		
17		
18	Plaintiff Ricardo Martinez is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights	
19	action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate	
20	Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
21	On January 9, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations,	
22	recommending that the instant action be dismissed as duplicative of Martinez v. Standon, Case	
23	No. 1:19-cv-00845-DAD-SAB (PC) (E.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2019) and Martinez v. Lewis., No. 1:19-	
24	cv-00812-DAD-SAB (PC) (E.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2019). (Doc. No. 13.) The findings and	
25	recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that objections thereto were due	
26	within twenty-one (21) days of service of the order. (Id.) No objections were filed and the time	
27	to do so has now passed.	
28	/////	
		1

1	While the above findings and recommendations were pending, the magistrate judge issued	
2	another set of findings and recommendations on March 6, 2020, recommending that plaintiff's	
3	motion for an emergency preliminary injunction be denied. (Doc. Nos. 19, 20.) Those findings	
4	and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that objections thereto were	
5	due within fourteen (14) days of service. (Doc. No. 20.) Plaintiff filed timely objections on	
6	March 16, 2020. (Doc. No. 21.)	
7	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304, this	
8	court has conducted a <i>de novo</i> review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file,	
9	including plaintiff's objections, the court concludes that the findings and recommendations are	
10	supported by the record and proper analysis.	
11	Accordingly,	
12	1. The findings and recommendations issued on January 9, 2020 and March 6, 2020	
13	(Doc. Nos. 13, 20) are adopted in full;	
14	2. The instant action is dismissed as duplicative;	
15	3. Plaintiff's motion for an emergency preliminary injunction (Doc. No. 19) is	
16	denied; and	
17	4. The Clerk of the Court is directed to close this case.	
18	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
19	Dated: April 9, 2020 Jale A. Dagd	
20	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	