1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	CURTIS LEE HENDERSON, SR.,	No. 1:20-cv-01199-AWI-SKO (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR A TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER (Doc. No. 16)
13	v.	
14	S. CASTILLO, JR., et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff Curtis Lee Henderson, Sr., is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma	
18	pauperis in this civil rights action. This matter was referred to a United States magistrate judge	
19	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Eastern District of California Local Rule 302.	
20	On November 24, 2020, the assigned magistrate judge filed findings and	
21	recommendations, recommending that Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order (Doc.	
22	No. 4) be denied. Doc. No. 16. The magistrate judge found that Plaintiff's request for single-cell	
23	status is now moot, and that his request for Defendants to "refrain from retaliation or activitie	
24	that violate the constitution" is not narrowly tailored. <u>Id.</u> at 2–3. The findings and	
25	recommendations were served on Plaintiff and provided him fourteen days to file objections	
26	thereto. <u>Id.</u> at 3.	
27	Plaintiff filed objections on December 29, 2020. Doc. No. 18. The objections are dated	
28	December 3, 2020, but do not include a proof of service and were not received by the Court until	

nearly four weeks later. Thus, it is unclear whether the objections were timely submitted to prison officials for mailing to the Court. Nevertheless, in an abundance of caution, the Court considers the objections. Therein, Plaintiff requests that the Court take "judicial notice" of the supplemental information he filed in support of his motion. The supplemental information, however, is not related to the claims in the motion. Doc. Nos. 4 & 14.

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, including Plaintiff's objections, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The findings and recommendations issued on November 24, 2020 (Doc. No. 16), are ADOPTED in full; and
- 2. Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order (Doc. No. 4) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: <u>January 5, 2021</u>

SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE