

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BARRY LOUIS LAMON,

Plaintiff,

2:06-cv-0156-GEB-KJM-P

vs.

DIRECTOR, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT  
OF CORRECTIONS, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_/

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General Order No. 262.

On July 1, 2009, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty days. Plaintiff has filed objections to the findings and recommendations. Plaintiff also takes issue with many of the magistrate judge’s rulings on discovery matters, included with the findings and recommendations on plaintiff’s motion for injunctive relief. Although challenges to the discovery ruling are more

///

1 properly brought in a motion for reconsideration under Local Rule No. 72-303, the court will  
2 consider them.

3 In addition, plaintiff objects to a number of the magistrate judge's prior rulings  
4 and to the management of this case in general. To the extent that plaintiff complains about the  
5 screening order, his objection is untimely. Local Rule 72-303(b).


6 Pursuant to Local Rule 72-303(f), a magistrate judge's orders shall be upheld  
7 unless "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that  
8 it does not appear that the magistrate judge's ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

9 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule  
10 72-304, this court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the  
11 entire file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by  
12 proper analysis.

13 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 14 1. Upon reconsideration, the magistrate judge's order of July 1, 2009, is affirmed;
- 15 2. The findings and recommendations filed July 1, 2009, are adopted in full; and
- 16 3. Plaintiff's January 20, 2009 motion for a preliminary injunction (Docket  
17 No. 116) is denied.

18 Dated: September 15, 2009

19  
20   
21 GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.  
United States District Judge