



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

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: November 25, 2024

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28