

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 JONES,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:11-cv-0192 MCE EFB P

vs.

TOFT, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_ /

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

On May 14, 2013, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days from the date the findings and recommendations were served. Plaintiff has filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire

1 file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by  
2 proper analysis.


3 Plaintiff complains that he has not seen the report authored by the court-appointed  
4 expert. The court will direct the Clerk of Court to send plaintiff a copy of the report.

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

6 1. The findings and recommendations filed May 14, 2013, are adopted in full;  
7 2. Plaintiff's motions for injunctive relief (Dckt. Nos. 135 and 139) are denied;  
8 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to send plaintiff a copy of the expert report  
9 appearing at Docket No. 142.

10 4. To the extent the Plaintiff's Objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and  
11 Recommendations (ECF No. 149) may be construed as a request for reconsideration of the  
12 magistrate judge's ruling with regard to Dr. Fee's impartiality as an expert, that request is  
13 denied. The Court concurs with the magistrate judge analysis that Dr. Fee should not be  
14 disqualified in that regard.

15 Date: August 05, 2013

16  
17  
18   
19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR., CHIEF JUDGE  
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26