| (PC) Bardo v | v. Martel et al   |                                |  |
|--------------|---|--------------------------------|--|
|              |   |                                |  |
|              |   |                                |  |
|              |   |                                |  |
| 1            |   |                                |  |
| 2            |   |                                |  |
| 3            |   |                                |  |
| 4            |   |                                |  |
| 5            |   |                                |  |
| 6            |   |                                |  |
| 7            |   |                                |  |
| 8            | IN THE  | E UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |  |
| 9            | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |                                |  |
| 10           | ROBERT J. BARDO,  |                                |  |
| 10           | Plaintiff,  | No. CIV S-09-3479 FCD EFB P    |  |
| 12           |   | No. CIV 5-09-34/9 FCD EFB F    |  |
|              | VS.   |                                |  |
| 13           | M. MARTEL, et al.,  Defendants.   | ODDED                          |  |
| 14           | Defendants.   | <u>ORDER</u>                   |  |
| 15           | District a state of   | /                              |  |
| 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 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.                                |                                |  |
| 19           | On March 8, 2011, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations                     |                                |  |
| 20           | herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any    |                                |  |
| 21           | objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Neither |                                |  |
| 22           | party has filed objections to the findings and recommendations.                               |                                |  |
| 23           | The court has reviewed the file and finds the findings and recommendations to be              |                                |  |
| 24           | supported by the record and by the magistrate judge's analysis. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY     |                                |  |
| 25           | ORDERED that:   |                                |  |
| 26           | /////   |                                |  |
|              |   | 1                              |  |

Doc. 33

| 1  | 1. The findings and recommendations filed March 8, 2011, are adopted in full; |
|----|---|
| 2  | and   |
| 3  | 2. Plaintiff's February 15, 2011 request for a temporary restraining order is |
| 4  | denied as moot.   |
| 5  | DATED: May 2, 2011.   |
| 6  | Just C Somm   |
| 7  | FRANK C. DAMRELL, JR.   |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  |
| 9  |   |
| 10 |   |
| 11 |   |
| 12 |   |
| 13 |   |
| 14 |   |
| 15 |   |
| 16 |   |
| 17 |   |
| 18 |   |
| 19 |   |
| 20 |   |
| 21 |   |
| 22 |   |
| 23 |   |
| 24 |   |
| 25 |   |