

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

RICKEY LOUIS ALFORD,
Plaintiff,
v.
SCOTT KERNAN and RICKY TAYLOR,
Defendants.

No. 2:19-cv-00732 KJM AC (PS)

ORDER

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed the above-entitled action. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as provided by Local Rule 302(c)(21). On July 23, 2019, the court adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations, dismissing the case with prejudice. ECF No. 5. However, on July 16, 2019—between the filing of the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations and the court’s July 23, 2019 order—plaintiff filed a motion for a temporary restraining order (“TRO”). ECF No. 4.

On July 30, 2019, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations regarding the TRO motion 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 days. ECF No. 7. Plaintiff has not filed objections to these 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.

1 *See Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by the
2 magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court . . .”).
3 Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by
4 the record and by the proper analysis.

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 6 1. The findings and recommendations filed July 30, 2019, are adopted in full;
- 7 2. Plaintiff’s motion for temporary restraining order (ECF No. 4) is DENIED; and
- 8 3. This case remains closed.

9 DATED: August 26, 2019.

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