



1 his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest.” (*Id.*) Therefore, the magistrate judge  
2 recommended the Court deny the motion. (*Id.* at 5.)

3 Plaintiff filed objections to the Findings and Recommendations. (Doc. 49.) Plaintiff  
4 again asserts that he was beating by unidentified officers following the filing of this action, and  
5 reiterates his fear that if he leaves his cell, he “would be in immediate danger.” (*Id.* at 1.)  
6 Importantly, however, Plaintiff does not address the findings of the magistrate judge that his  
7 assertions are not tethered to the claims raised in his complaint. Moreover, Plaintiff’s generalized  
8 fear for his safety is insufficient to support his request for injunctive relief. *See, e.g., Goldie's*  
9 *Bookstore v. Superior Court of State of Cal.*, 739 F.2d 466, 472 (9th Cir. 1984) (“Speculative  
10 injury does not constitute irreparable injury”); *see also Bradford v. Jordan*, 2018 WL 11328113,  
11 at \*3 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2018) (“Moreover, although Plaintiff alleges instances of harm suffered  
12 from prison officials, Plaintiff’s speculative fear of a conspiracy to murder him by nearly 40  
13 individuals does not constitute irreparable injury sufficient to warrant granting a preliminary  
14 injunction”).

15 According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court performed a *de novo* review of this case.  
16 Having carefully reviewed the matter, including Plaintiff’s objections, the Court concludes the  
17 Findings and Recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court

18 **ORDERS:**

- 19 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on April 8, 2024 (Doc. 47) are  
20 **ADOPTED** in full.
- 21 2. Plaintiff’s motion for a temporary restraining order (Doc. 44) is **DENIED**.

22  
23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: May 8, 2024

25  
26  
27  
28  
  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE