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 (PS)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING MOTIONS FOR ASSISTANCE CONSTRUED AS MOTIONS FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

(Doc. Nos. 22, 23, 44)

Plaintiff Roland Thomas Koch is a former civil detainee proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in the above-captioned civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(21).

On June 17, 2026, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that plaintiff's motions for assistance (Doc. Nos. 22, 23), construed by the court as motions for preliminary injunctions, be denied for the same reasons as previously stated by this court. (Doc. No. 44) (citing Doc. Nos. 17, 19, 25). Specifically, the magistrate judge concluded that plaintiff had again moved the court to issue a cease and desist order preventing his arrest for homelessness and seeking a conference at which to discuss this issue, just as he had so moved in the past. (Doc. No. 44 at 1.) In those prior findings and recommendations the magistrate judge had concluded that plaintiff was not entitled to preliminary injunctive relief because there was no

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

nexus between his claims brought in this action and the preliminary injunctive relief he sought, this court lacks personal jurisdiction over the persons plaintiff seeks to enjoin, and plaintiff had failed to show that consideration of the relevant factors under *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008) weighed in favor of granting his motions. (Doc. Nos. 17 at 2; 19 at 1–2; 25 at 2.)

The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days of service. (Doc. No. 44 at 4.) On June 23, 2026, the court received plaintiff's motion in response to the findings and recommendations which the court will construe as plaintiff's objections. (Doc. No. 45.) Plaintiff's objections are somewhat difficult to decipher, do state that plaintiff "is fully ready for trial" (*id.* at 2), but provide no basis upon which to reject the pending findings and recommendations.

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

Accordingly,

1. The findings and recommendations issued on June 17, 2026 (Doc. No. 44) are adopted in full;
2. Plaintiff's motions for assistance (Doc. Nos. 22, 23), construed as motions for a preliminary injunction, are denied; and
3. This action is referred back to the assigned magistrate judge for further proceedings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **September 3, 2026**

Dale A. Drozd

DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE