1			
1 2			
2			
4			
5			
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
8			
9	WILLIAM VERA, aka Memo Vera,	1:22-cv-00893-KES-CDB (PC)	
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND	
11	v.	RECOMMENDATIONS TO DENY MOTIONS FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND	
12	WARDEN, et al.,	PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION	
13	Defendants.	(Doc. 62)	
14			
15			
16	Plaintiff William Vera, also known as Memo Vera, is a state prisoner proceeding pro se		
17	and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter		
18	was referred to a United States magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local		
19	Rule 302.		
20	On November 22, 2023, plaintiff filed a motion for a temporary restraining order and/or		
21	preliminary injunction. Doc. 52. Plaintiff filed another motion for a preliminary injunction on		
22	November 29, 2023, and included additional documents in support of his claim that his legal and		
23	customary mail was censored. Doc. 53. On April 10, 2024, the assigned magistrate judge issued		
24	findings and recommendations to deny plaintiff's motions for a temporary restraining order and		
25	preliminary injunction because plaintiff had not established that he was likely to succeed on the		
26	merits of his claims, had not established he was likely to suffer irreparable harm, and had not		
27	established that the balance of equities tipped	in favor of granting a preliminary injunction. Doc.	
28			

1 62. Plaintiff filed timely objections on June 24, 2024. Doc. 67.

1	52. Frantin fred timery objections on June 24, 2024. Doc. 07.	ł	
2	In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1), the Court has conducted a de novo review of		
3	this case. In his objections, plaintiff argues that defendants' obstructionism will likely continue to		
4	have a chilling effect on plaintiff's constitutional rights and that the defendants have a		
5	conspiratory alliance with the local post office to censor mail. Doc. 67 at 2. Plaintiff also		
6	conclusory argues that the balance of equities tips in his favor, that injunctive relief is in the		
7	public interest, and that he will likely succeed on the merits. Id. at 3. However, plaintiff's		
8	objections do not meaningfully challenge the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations.		
9	Plaintiff's vague and conclusory allegations of obstructionism, retaliation, and conspiracy are		
10	insufficient and do not establish any basis for the extraordinary remedy of a temporary restraining		
11	order or preliminary injunction.		
12	Having carefully reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be		
13	supported by the record and by proper analysis.		
14	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:		
15	1. The findings and recommendations issued on April 10, 2024 (Doc. 62) are ADOPTED		
16	IN FULL; and		
17	2. Plaintiff's motions for injunctive relief (Docs. 52, 53) are DENIED.		
18			
19			
20	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
21	Dated: <u>November 25, 2024</u> UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	2		
		I	