

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL KRAUSE,
Petitioner,
v.
TARA KRAUSE,
Respondent.

No. 1:21-cv-01706-JLT-SAB
**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING
MOTION FOR TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER AND CONTEMPT
SANCTIONS**
(Docs. 41, 69)

The assigned magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations that Petitioner’s motion for a temporary restraining order and contempt sanctions (Doc. 41)¹ be denied. (Doc. 69.) The magistrate judge found that because a concurrent order granted the primary requested relief sought by Petitioner when he filed the motion for a temporary restraining order, a temporary restraining order was unnecessary to preserve the status quo and to prevent irreparable harm to the Petitioner. (*Id.* at 12.) The magistrate judge also found that, to the extent a recommendation was required to deny the requested contempt sanctions, such request for certification of a finding of contempt should be denied. (*Id.* at 11.) The findings and recommendations notified all parties that they may file objections within 14 days. (*Id.* at 3.) No objections were filed by either party within the period to do so.

///

¹ The motion was entered on the docket as a memorandum. (Doc. 41.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court ORDERS:

1. The findings and recommendations issued on May 20, 2022 (Doc. 69) are **ADOPTED** in full.
2. Petitioner’s motion for a temporary restraining order and finding of contempt (Doc. 41) is **DENIED**.
3. This matter is referred to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 21, 2022


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE