

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

CHARLES FORDJOUR,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-09-1800 JAM EFB P

vs.

JANET NAPOLITANO, et al.

ORDER

Respondents.

_____ /
Petitioner is currently in the custody of United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”). He seeks a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, challenging his detention. On February 2, 2010, findings and recommendations were issued by the undersigned recommending that petitioner’s motions for injunctive relief and related motions (Docket Nos. 45, 47, 48 and 53) be denied. Petitioner, through newly-appointed counsel, informed the court that he did not object to the recommendations. Dckt. No. 67 at 4-5. However, on March 31, 2010, petitioner filed a pro se “Emergency Motion and Request for De Novo Review” of his motions for injunctive relief (Docket Nos. 45 and 48).

By order dated April 21, 2010, the assigned district judge adopted the proposed findings and recommendations in full and denied petitioner’s motions for injunctive relief. In doing so, the district judge conducted a de novo review of the case in accordance with the provisions of 28

1 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304. Petitioner’s “Emergency Motion” is therefore denied
2 as moot. The court admonishes petitioner that, as he is now represented by counsel, the court
3 will not entertain any future motions not filed through counsel.

4 Dated: June 16, 2010.

5 
6 EDMUND F. BRENNAN
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26