

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 LACEDRIC W. JOHNSON,

11 Plaintiff,

No. 2:08-cv-1609 KJM KJN P

12 vs.

13 D. K. SISTO, et al.,

14 Defendants.

ORDER

15 _____/
16 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action
17 seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate
18 Judge as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

19 On March 22, 2013, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations,
20 which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to
21 the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Neither party has filed
22 objections to the findings and recommendations.

23 The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *See Orand v. United*
24 *States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are
25 reviewed de novo. *See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir.

26 /////


1 1983). Having carefully reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to
2 be supported by the record and by the proper analysis.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

4 1. The findings and recommendations filed March 22, 2013, are adopted in full.

5 2. Plaintiff's March 8, 2013 motion for injunctive relief (dkt. no. 154) is denied
6 without prejudice.

7 DATED: June 20, 2013.

8 
9 _____
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26