

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

ANTHONY E. MACK,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-08-3161 KJM-EFB P

vs.

TILTON, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_ /

This matter comes before the court upon plaintiff’s filing of a motion to stay judgment or, in the alternative, strike the decision. (ECF 27.) For the following reasons, this motion is DENIED.


The magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Rule 304. (ECF 22.) The undersigned reviewed these findings and recommendations de novo, as well as plaintiff’s objections, and adopted them in full. (ECF 25.) Local Rule 110 states: “Failure of . . . a party to comply with these Rules or any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court.” Plaintiff failed to comply with a court order issued on July 20, 2010 (ECF 17), despite being granted two extensions of time. (ECF 19 & 21.) Plaintiff’s contentions that “there were no findings made preceding this decision and the decision

1 by this court absconds from the proposed finding [sic] and recommendations filed on December  
2 6, 2010 . . .” are simply not true. Moreover, “no subsequent findings or court order . . .” or “de  
3 novo determination on the proposed findings [following] for resolution on the constitutional  
4 issues raised” were necessary. Furthermore, this decision does not exceed the Federal Rules of  
5 Civil Procedure or other federal law.

6 For the foregoing reasons, plaintiff’s motion is DENIED.

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 DATED: April 7, 2011.

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