1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	MARK FREGIA,	No. 1:21-cv-01068 JLT BAM (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING
13	v.	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EMERGENCY INJUNCTION
14	MIRANDA, et al.,	(Doc. 90)
15	Defendants.	(Doc. 90)
16		
17	Mark Fregia asserts that Defendants Ridge and Savage demonstrated deliberate indifferent	
18	to Plaintiff's serious medical needs by continuing to prescribe medications that caused him to	
19	suffer lichen planus and then failed to treat such skin condition.	
20	Plaintiff next filed a notice to the Court regarding his property. (Doc. 89.) Afterwards, he	
21	filed a request for emergency injunction and stay of further proceedings (Doc. 90), and then he	
22	filed a motion for Ridge to be directed to obtain his own counsel (Doc. 91).	
23	The assigned magistrate judge issued an order finding no merit to Plaintiff's argument that	
24	the Attorney General's representation of Ridge created a conflict of interest and denied Plaintiff's	
25	motion to stay the proceedings in this action. (Doc. 92.) The magistrate judge also issued	
26	Findings and Recommendations to deny Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief. (Id.) The	
27	deadline for Plaintiff to file any objections to the Findings and Recommendations was extended	
28	during the pendency of an appeal to the Ninth	Circuit. (Docs. 93, 97, 98.) Following dismissal of
		1

1	the appeal for lack of jurisdiction, the magistrate judge reset the deadline for Plaintiff's to file any		
2	objections. (Docs. 99, 100.)		
3	Plaintiff timely filed objections. (Doc. 104.) Plaintiff reiterates many of his arguments		
4	regarding the alleged conflict of interest presented by the Attorney General's Office		
5	representation of Ridge, as well as his disagreement with the finding that Plaintiff's loss of legal		
6	property does not require stay of this action. (Id.) Significantly, however, Plaintiff does not		
7	contest the finding that the Court lacks jurisdiction over the prison officials who might carry out		
8	the requested relief. Plaintiff also does not establish that he will suffer irreparable harm in the		
9	absence of such relief. Thus, Plaintiff fails to show the requested injunctive relief should be		
10	granted. Plaintiff's remaining arguments—which relate to the other motions addressed by the		
11	magistrate judge— are not relevant to the Court's review of the instant motion.		
12	According to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), this Court conducted a <i>de novo</i> review of the		
13	case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including Plaintiff's objections, the Court		
14	concludes that the Findings and Recommendations are supported by the record and by proper		
15	analysis. Thus, the Court <b>ORDERS</b> :		
16	1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on March 8, 2023 (Doc. 92), are		
17	ADOPTED in full.		
18	2. Plaintiff's motion for emergency injunction (Doc. 90) is <b>DENIED</b> .		
19	3. The matter is referred to the assigned Magistrate Judge for further proceedings.		
20			
21	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
22	Dated: May 24, 2023		
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	2		