UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROLAND THOMAS KOCH,

Plaintiff,

v.

SHERIFF, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:25-cv-01791-DAD-AC (PC)

ORDER ADOPTING IN FULL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTIONS FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

(Doc. Nos. 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20)

Plaintiff Ronald Thomas Koch is a former civil detainee proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On January 16, 2026 and January 29, 2026, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that plaintiff's motions for assistance (Doc. No. 13), for a cease and desist order (Doc. No. 15), and for emergency assistance (Doc. No. 18), all construed as motions for preliminary injunctive relief, be denied. (Doc. No. 17, 19.)

The pending findings and recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within twenty-one (21) days after service. (Doc. Nos. 17 at 3, 19 at 2.) On February 2, 2026, plaintiff filed what has been docketed as

/////

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

objections to the findings and recommendations. (Doc. No. 21.) That filing, however, presents no basis upon which the court should reject either of the pending findings and recommendations.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a *de novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, including plaintiff's objections, the court concludes that the findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis.

Accordingly:

1. The findings and recommendations issued on January 16, 2026 (Doc. No. 17) and January 29, 2026 (Doc. No. 19) are adopted in full;
2. Plaintiff's motions for assistance (Doc. No. 13), for a cease and desist order (Doc. No. 15), and for emergency assistance (Doc. No. 18), all construed by the court as motions for preliminary injunctive relief, are denied;
3. Plaintiff's request for a hearing (Doc. No. 20) is also denied; and
4. This matter is referred back to the magistrate judge for further proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **March 15, 2026**

Dale A. Drozd

DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE