1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	KRZYSZTOF F. WOLINSKI,	Case No. 2:17-cv-00583-MCE-AC
12	Plaintiff,	
13	V.	ORDER
14	J. LEWIS, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	On September 21, 2023, an Order	of this Court was filed adopting the magistrate
17 18		of this Court was filed adopting the magistrate ed at ECF No. 75 and dismissing this case in
		ed at ECF No. 75 and dismissing this case in
18	judge's findings and recommendations file part. ECF No. 78. The Motions for Recor	ed at ECF No. 75 and dismissing this case in
18 19	judge's findings and recommendations file part. ECF No. 78. The Motions for Recor	ed at ECF No. 75 and dismissing this case in nsideration (ECF Nos. 80 and 82) of the
18 19 20	judge's findings and recommendations file part. ECF No. 78. The Motions for Recommagistrate judge's decision denying Plain 77) are thus DENIED as moot.	ed at ECF No. 75 and dismissing this case in nsideration (ECF Nos. 80 and 82) of the
18 19 20 21	judge's findings and recommendations file part. ECF No. 78. The Motions for Recommagistrate judge's decision denying Plain 77) are thus DENIED as moot. The Court nonetheless construes to	ed at ECF No. 75 and dismissing this case in insideration (ECF Nos. 80 and 82) of the tiff additional time to file objections (ECF No.
18 19 20 21 22	judge's findings and recommendations file part. ECF No. 78. The Motions for Recommagistrate judge's decision denying Plain 77) are thus DENIED as moot. The Court nonetheless construes to	ed at ECF No. 75 and dismissing this case in insideration (ECF Nos. 80 and 82) of the tiff additional time to file objections (ECF No. the Objections and Recommendations of this Court's own
18 19 20 21 22 23	judge's findings and recommendations file part. ECF No. 78. The Motions for Recommagistrate judge's decision denying Plain 77) are thus DENIED as moot. The Court nonetheless construes the subsequently filed at ECF No. 83 as a Motor of the Court nonetheless.	ed at ECF No. 75 and dismissing this case in insideration (ECF Nos. 80 and 82) of the tiff additional time to file objections (ECF No. the Objections and Recommendations of this Court's own
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	judge's findings and recommendations file part. ECF No. 78. The Motions for Recommagistrate judge's decision denying Plain 77) are thus DENIED as moot. The Court nonetheless construes to subsequently filed at ECF No. 83 as a Modispositive Order at ECF No. 78. That Modispositive Order at ECF No. 78.	ed at ECF No. 75 and dismissing this case in insideration (ECF Nos. 80 and 82) of the tiff additional time to file objections (ECF No. the Objections and Recommendations of this Court's own
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	judge's findings and recommendations file part. ECF No. 78. The Motions for Recommagistrate judge's decision denying Plain 77) are thus DENIED as moot. The Court nonetheless construes to subsequently filed at ECF No. 83 as a Modispositive Order at ECF No. 78. That Modispositive Order at ECF No. 78. That Modispositive Order at ECF No. 78.	ed at ECF No. 75 and dismissing this case in insideration (ECF Nos. 80 and 82) of the tiff additional time to file objections (ECF No. the Objections and Recommendations of this Court's own
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	judge's findings and recommendations file part. ECF No. 78. The Motions for Recommagistrate judge's decision denying Plain 77) are thus DENIED as moot. The Court nonetheless construes the subsequently filed at ECF No. 83 as a Model dispositive Order at ECF No. 78. That Model IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: October 12, 2023	ed at ECF No. 75 and dismissing this case in insideration (ECF Nos. 80 and 82) of the tiff additional time to file objections (ECF No. the Objections and Recommendations of this Court's own option (EF No. 83) is DENIED.