

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOSE ARBOR CAMPOS-RODRIGUEZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN DAGOSTINI, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-1448 KJM DB P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a county inmate proceeding pro se with an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff alleges defendants violated his right of access to the court by failing to provide him with adequate law library facilities. (ECF No. 1.) The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On July 2, 2018, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations addressing plaintiff’s pending motion for a preliminary injunction. The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice to plaintiff that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. (ECF No. 11.) Plaintiff has not filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. *See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). Having reviewed

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

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 4 1. The findings and recommendations filed July 2, 2018 (ECF No. 11) are adopted in full
5 to the extent they address plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction;
- 6 2. Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction (ECF No. 10) is denied; and
- 7 3. This case is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for all further pretrial
8 proceedings.

9 DATED: September 24, 2018.

10 
11 _____
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28