1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	JEREMY JAMISON,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-10-0124 KJM EFB P
12	VS.
13	BAILLIE, et al.,
14	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>
15	/
16	Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding through counsel, has filed this civil rights
17	action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States
18	Magistrate Judge as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.
19	On September 22, 2011, the magistrate judge filed findings and
20	recommendations, which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that
21	any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days.
22	Neither party has filed 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

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	On July 27, 2011, the parties filed a stipulation regarding plaintiff's requests for
4	injunctive relief. (ECF Nos. 114, 118 &122). The court has reviewed the stipulation and also
5	finds it appropriate.
6	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:
7	1. The findings and recommendations filed September 22, 2011, are adopted in
8	full;
9	2. Defendants' August 22, 2011 motion to dismiss is denied as moot;
10	3. The parties' stipulation regarding injunctive relief (ECF No. 122) is adopted;
11	and
12	4. Plaintiff's motions for injunctive relief (ECF Nos. 104, 114 & 118) are denied
13	as moot.
14	DATED: March 21, 2012.
15	A mule
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	2

I

I