UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT B UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CLARENCE A. GIPBSIN, Plaintiff, V. ORDER Plaintiff, ORDER Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seekin under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge puring 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations he which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any object the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Plaintiff has file	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CLARENCE A. GIPBSIN, Plaintiff, V. ORDER SCOTT KERNAN, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seekin under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge put 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations he which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on the served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on the ser	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CLARENCE A. GIPBSIN, Plaintiff, V. ORDER Plaintiff, ORDER Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seekin under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pur 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations he which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective.	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CLARENCE A. GIPBSIN, Plaintiff, V. ORDER SCOTT KERNAN, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pure 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective.	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CLARENCE A. GIPBSIN, Plaintiff, V. ORDER SCOTT KERNAN, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pure 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective.	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CLARENCE A. GIPBSIN, Plaintiff, V. ORDER SCOTT KERNAN, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pure 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective.	
B UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 CLARENCE A. GIPBSIN, Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER 14 SCOTT KERNAN, et al., 15 Defendants. Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seekin under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pur 19 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations he which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective	
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CLARENCE A. GIPBSIN, Plaintiff, V. ORDER SCOTT KERNAN, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pure 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective.	
CLARENCE A. GIPBSIN, Plaintiff, V. ORDER SCOTT KERNAN, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pur 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective.	
CLARENCE A. GIPBSIN, Plaintiff, v. GRDER Plaintiff, pefendants. Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pure 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on the	
Plaintiff, V. ORDER SCOTT KERNAN, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pure 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective.	
V. ORDER SCOTT KERNAN, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pure 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objects.	
SCOTT KERNAN, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pure 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective.	
Defendants. Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pure 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objective served on the served o	
Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pure 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have the was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pure 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have the was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pure 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have the was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pure 29 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pure 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have the wave served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections.	
under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pure 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objects	
28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations have which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objects	g relief
On October 25, 2017, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations he which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objects	suant to
which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objects	
	rein
the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Plaintiff has file	ons to
the imanigs and recommendations were to be fried within routeen days. I family has in	d
objections to the findings and recommendations.	
In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 30-	, this
court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire	ile, the
court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper	• ·
27 analysis.	
28 /////	

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The findings and recommendations filed October 25, 2017, are adopted in full; and
- 2. Plaintiff's Motion for Special Medical Court Order (ECF No. 177) is denied.

Dated: November 15, 2017

GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.

Senior United States District Judge