1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	DAVID W. WILSON,	Case No.: 1:22-cv-0874 JLT SKO (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS IN FULL AND
13	V.	DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PROTECTION ORDER (Docs. 20, 23)
14	STUART SHERMAN, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	David W. Wilson seeks to hold the defendants liable for civil rights violations pursuant to	
18	42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff seeks a "protection order for all Legal Documents, and for Single	
19	Cell, for imminent danger Transfer where conspiracy was undertaken to place plaintiff as	
20	Enhanced Out Patient (EOP) by Psychologist." (Doc. 20 at 1, emphasis omitted.)	
21	The magistrate judge construed Plaintiff's motion as a request for temporary and/or	
22	permanent injunctive relief. (Doc. 23 at 1.) The magistrate judge found Plaintiff did not	
23	demonstrate he was likely to succeed on the merits of his claim and did not show he was likely to	
24	suffer irreparable harm. (Id. at 4.) Furthermore, the magistrate judge noted the EOP designation	
25	was not related to the allegations raised in the First Amended Complaint, which "concerns	
26	conditions of confinement claims involving ventilation issues and allegations of black mold." (Id.	
27	at 5.) Finally, the magistrate judge found Plaintiff did not show "injunctive relief would be in the	
28	public interest." (Id. at 6.) Therefore, the magistrate judge recommended the motion be denied.	

1 (*Id*.) 2 The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on Plaintiff, which contained a 3 notice that any objections were due within fourteen days of the date of service. (Doc. 23 at 6.) In 4 addition, the magistrate judge advised Plaintiff that the "failure to file objections within the 5 specified time may result in waiver of his rights on appeal." (Id., citing Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 6 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014); Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991). To date, 7 Plaintiff has not filed objections, and the time to do so has expired. 8 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this Court conducted a de novo review of this case. 9 Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations to 10 be supported by the record and proper analysis. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS**: 11 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on May 1, 2023 (Doc. 23) are 12 **ADOPTED** in full. 2. 13 Plaintiff's motion for protection order filed March 3, 2023 (Doc. 20) is **DENIED**. 14 3. The matter is referred to the magistrate judge for further proceedings. 15 IT IS SO ORDERED. 16 nnifu [] myy Dated: May 24, 2023 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

28