

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ANTONIO CRAWFORD,

Plaintiff

vs.

HARLEY LAPPIN, et al.,

Defendants

CIVIL NO. 1:CV-10-2250

FILED
HARRISBURG, PA

DEC 17 2010

MARY E. D'ANDREA, CLERK
Per *MED*
Deputy Clerk

ORDER

THE BACKGROUND OF THIS ORDER IS AS FOLLOWS:

We are considering the report and recommendation of the magistrate judge, recommending that the pro se plaintiff's motion for access to the prison law library "as needed" be denied. Plaintiff filed no objections to the report, and we agree with the magistrate judge that the motion should be denied. As noted by the magistrate judge, any need for legal research time can be accommodated by extensions of time to meet any relevant deadline in this action. We further note that Plaintiff asserts he needs the time to do legal research in connection with the magistrate judge's order requiring him to file an amended complaint. But that order, after setting forth the appropriate case law, requires Plaintiff to meet certain criteria for pleading factual allegations, so unfettered access to a law library is not paramount.

Accordingly, this 2nd day of December, 2010, upon consideration of the report (doc. 9) of the magistrate judge, filed November 8, 2010, to which no objections were filed, and upon independent review of the record, it is ordered that:

1. The magistrate judge's recommendation is adopted.

2. Plaintiff's motion (doc. 7) for a preliminary injunction is denied.

/s/William W. Caldwell
William W. Caldwell
United States District Judge