

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

**WO**

**KM**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Steven Ho,	)	No. CV 11-904-PHX-GMS (MEA)
Plaintiff,	)	<b>ORDER</b>
vs.	)	
Benjamin Griego, et al.,	)	
Defendants.	)	

On May 5, 2011, Plaintiff Steven Ho, who is confined in the Corrections Corporation of America-Saguaro Correctional Center (CCA-SCC), filed a *pro se* civil rights Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and an Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*. In a May 18, 2011 Order, the Court granted the Application to Proceed and dismissed the Complaint because Plaintiff had failed to state a claim. The Court gave Plaintiff 30 days to file an amended complaint that cured the deficiencies identified in the Order.

On June 15, 2011, Plaintiff filed his First Amended Complaint. On June 23, 2011, Plaintiff filed another "First Amended Complaint," which the Court construed as a Second Amended Complaint (Doc. 10). On July 6, 2011, the Court dismissed the Second Amended Complaint and this action for failure to state a claim (Doc. 14), and the Clerk of Court entered Judgment (Doc. 15). On August 21, 2011, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals (Doc. 38).

Pending before the Court are the following Motions:

- (1) Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time to Make Copies of New Documents

- 1 (Doc. 27);
- 2 (2) Motion to Request Information from Judge Snow (Doc. 26);
- 3 (3) Motions Under Rule 56(f) to Obtain Declarations (Docs. 30, 31, and 32);
- 4 (4) Motion to Apply Rule 59(e) and Rule 56(f) (Doc. 33);
- 5 (5) Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint (Doc. 35);
- 6 (6) Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Doc. 36); and
- 7 (7) Motion for Leave to Proceed In Forma Pauperis (Doc. 43).

8 Plaintiff has also filed numerous “Declarations.”

9 This case has been dismissed and Plaintiff’s Motions are therefore moot. To the  
10 extent that Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of the Court’s dismissal, the Court has already  
11 considered and denied, in an August 4, 2011 Order, Plaintiff’s previous request for  
12 reconsideration.

13 **IT IS ORDERED:**

- 14 (1) Plaintiff’s Motion for Extension of Time to Make Copies of New Documents  
15 (Doc. 27) is **denied**.
- 16 (2) Plaintiff’s Motion to Request Information from Judge Snow (Doc. 26) is  
17 **denied**.
- 18 (3) Plaintiff’s Motions Under Rule 56(f) to Obtain Declarations (Docs. 30, 31, and  
19 32) are **denied**.
- 20 (4) Plaintiff’s Motion to Apply Rule 59(e) and Rule 56(f) (Doc. 33) is **denied**.
- 21 (5) Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to File an Amended Complaint (Doc. 35) is  
22 **denied**.
- 23 (6) Plaintiff’s Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Doc. 36) is **denied**.

24 ...

25 ...


26 ...

27 ...

28 ...

1 (7) Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* (Doc. 43) is  
2 **denied.**

3 DATED this 1st day of September, 2011.

4  
5   
6 \_\_\_\_\_  
7 G. Murray Snow  
8 United States District Judge  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28