

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

MARCUS JAMES BREWER,

Plaintiff,

v.

FLOREZ, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-2003-KJM-EFB P

ORDER

Plaintiff, a county inmate 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 as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On July 17, 2018, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on plaintiff and which contained notice to plaintiff that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen one days. Plaintiff has not filed objections to the findings and recommendations.¹

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.

¹ Although it appears from the file that plaintiff’s copy of the findings and recommendations was returned, plaintiff was properly served. It is the plaintiff’s responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

1 *See Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). Having reviewed
2 the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by
3 the proper analysis.

4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 5 1. The findings and recommendations filed July 17, 2018, are adopted in full;
- 6 2. Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order (ECF No. 14) is DENIED; and
- 7 3. This case is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for all further pretrial
8 proceedings.

9 DATED: September 12, 2018.

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