

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 *de novo* 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 **ORDERS**:

- 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 **DENIED**.
- 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


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE