UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DERRICK JEROME LEWIS,

Plaintiff,

ORDER ADOPTING IN FULL THE FINDINGS

AND RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING

V.

THIS CASE FOR FAILURE TO STATE A

CLAIM WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND,

KATHLEEN ALLISON, et al.,

Defendants.

Defendants.

Defendants.

(Docs. 1, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23)

Derrick Jerome Lewis is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff named about 40 unrelated individuals, government entities, and private businesses such as Apple, Inc. and Chase Bank as defendants. (Doc. 1 at 5.) Plaintiff alleges the defendants committed identity theft, fraud, forgery, and violated his Fourteenth Amendment Due Process and Equal Protection rights. (*Id.* at 4–7.) Plaintiff also filed several motions for injunctive relief. (Docs. 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21.) The Court referred the matter to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

The assigned magistrate screened Plaintiff's complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a) and found "Plaintiff's complaint does not allege sufficient facts from which the court can draw a reasonable inference that any defendant violated federal law." (Doc. 23 at 7.) In addition, the magistrate judge determined Plaintiff's complaint lacks "facial plausibility." (*Id.*) The magistrate judge found

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
1	0	
1	1	
1	2	
1	3	
1	4	
1	5	
1	6	
1	7	
1	8	
1	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	
2	4	
2	5	
2	6	
2	7	

28

"Plaintiff's complaint consists almost entirely of fanciful and delusional allegations, amending which would be futile." (*Id.* at 10.) The magistrate judge recommended Plaintiff's complaint be dismissed without leave to amend. (*Id.* at 12.) In addition, the magistrate judge recommended Plaintiff's motions for injunctive relief be denied. (*Id.* at 11-12.)

The Court served the Findings and Recommendations on Plaintiff and notified him that any objections were due within 30 days. (Doc. 23 at 12.) The Court advised Plaintiff that the "failure to file objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal." (*Id.*, citing *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014).) Plaintiff did not file objections, and the time to do so has passed.

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

- The Findings and Recommendations issued on February 26, 2024 (Doc. 23) are
 ADOPTED in full.
- 2. Plaintiff's motions for injunctive relief (Docs. 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21) are **DENIED**.
- 3. All pending motions and deadlines are terminated, and this case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice for failure to state a claim.
- 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 28, 2024