1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 DEVONTE B. HARRIS, No. 1:22-cv-00204-DAD-HBK (PC) 12 Plaintiff. 13 $\frac{\text{ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND}}{\text{RECOMMENDATIONS}}$ v. 14 E. SILVA, et al., (Doc. No. 10) 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff Devonte B. Harris is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. No. 1.) The matter was referred to a United States 18 Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. 19 On April 14, 2022, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations, 20 21 recommending that plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction be denied. (Doc. No. 10.) 22 Specifically, the assigned magistrate judge concluded that plaintiff has not shown that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm. (Id. at 5.) Those findings and recommendations were served on 23 24 plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days of service. (*Id.* at 8.) On May 2, 2022, plaintiff filed objections with the court. (Doc. No. 25 26 12.) Therein, plaintiff does not advance a persuasive argument as to how he is likely to suffer 27 irreparable harm so as to warrant the extraordinary remedy of immediate injunctive relief against

28

defendants.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the court has conducted a de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including plaintiff's objections, the court concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis. Accordingly, 1. The findings and recommendations issued on April 14, 2022 (Doc. No. 10) are adopted; 2. Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction (Doc. No. 2) is denied; and 3. This action is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings. IT IS SO ORDERED. August 9, 2022 Dated: _