

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FILED

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

DEC 17 2019

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

In re: JONATHON ANDREW HAMPTON.

No. 19-73047

JONATHON ANDREW HAMPTON,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, SACRAMENTO,

Respondent,

STATE OF CALIFORNIA; et al.,

Real Parties in Interest.

D.C. No.

2:19-cv-00851-JAM-DB

Eastern District of California,
Sacramento

ORDER

Before: THOMAS, Chief Judge, BERZON and BRESS, Circuit Judges.

Petitioner has not demonstrated that this case warrants the intervention of the court by means of the extraordinary remedy of mandamus. *See Bauman v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 557 F.2d 650 (9th Cir. 1977). Accordingly, the petition is denied.

No further filings will be accepted in this closed case.

DENIED.

Ex A
1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 JONATHON ANDREW HAMPTON,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

No. 2:19-cv-0851 JAM DB P

ORDER

17 Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief
18 under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to
19 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

20 On July 25, 2019, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which
21 were served on plaintiff and which contained notice to plaintiff that any objections to the findings
22 and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. (ECF No. 8.) Plaintiff has filed
23 objections to the findings and recommendations. (ECF No. 11.)

24 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this
25 court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the
26 court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper
27 analysis.

28 /////

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The findings and recommendations filed July 25, 2019, are adopted in full;

2. Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief and petition for writ of mandamus (ECF No. 7)
is denied.

DATED: October 7, 2019

/s/ John A. Mendez

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE