

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THOMAS EUGENE GRAY,	)	No.: 1:20-cv-00196-NONE-SAB (PC)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	<u>ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND</u>
v.	)	<u>RECOMMENDATIONS, AND DENYING</u>
	)	<u>PLAINTIFF’S REQUEST FOR INJUNCTIVE</u>
KEN CLARK, et.al.,	)	<u>RELIEF</u>
	)	(Doc. Nos. 18, 19)
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff Thomas Eugene Gray is appearing *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action 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 May 27, 2020, the magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that plaintiff’s request for injunctive relief be denied. (Doc. No. 19.) The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that objections were to be filed within thirty days. (*Id.*) No objections were filed and the time to do so has now expired.

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 by proper analysis. As the findings and

1 recommendations explain, plaintiff seeks an order directing the law librarian at the prison where he is  
2 incarcerated to assist him and provide him with access to law library services. This action is  
3 proceeding on plaintiff's claims for failure to protect and excessive use of force against various non-  
4 library correctional staff. The law librarian is not a party to this action and there is no claim in the  
5 case that relates directly to court access. Moreover, although plaintiff asserts in conclusory fashion  
6 that the law librarian is denying him access to services in a way that obstructs his ability to prosecute  
7 this case, this action has been stayed and referred to post-screening alternative dispute resolution.  
8 Accordingly, it is not immediately apparent how any claimed lack of law library access could be  
9 impeding plaintiff's prosecution of this matter.

10 Accordingly:

- 11 1. The findings and recommendations filed on May 27, 2020, (Doc. No. 19), are adopted  
12 in full; and
- 13 2. Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief, filed on May 22, 2020 (Doc. No. 18), is denied.

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: July 16, 2020

16   
17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28