(PC) Contreraz v.	Adams, et al	Doc. 51
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STA	TES DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	QUETZAL CONTRERAZ,	1:04-cv-06039-LJO-GSA-PC
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR COURT ORDER DIRECTING PRISON OFFICIALS TO RETURN PLAINTIFF'S LEGAL MATERIALS (Doc. 50.)
13	v. )	
14	D. ADAMS, et al.,	
15		ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION OF
16	Defendants.	TIME TO FILE RESPONSE TO MOTION TO DISMISS
17		FORTY-FIVE DAY DEADLINE
18		)
19	Quetzal Contreraz ("Plaintiff") is a prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action pursuant	
20	to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On October 4, 2010, Plaintiff filed a motion for a court order directing prison	
21	officials to provide him with his legal materials, which he requires to prepare a response to Defendant	
22	Adams' motion to dismiss of May 17, 2010. (Doc. 50.) Plaintiff explains that he was placed in Ad-Seg	
23	in June 2010 and has not been given all of his legal materials. Plaintiff asserts that he filed a prison	
24	grievance for return of his materials, but he has not received a response.	
25	With regard to Plaintiff's request for a court order directing prison officials to return his legal	
26	materials, the Court recognizes that prison administrators "should be accorded wide-ranging deference	
27	in the adoption and execution of policies and practices that in their judgment are needed to preserve	
28		1

internal order and discipline and to maintain institutional security." Whitley v. Albers, 475 U.S. 312, 321-322 (1986) (quoting Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520, 547 (1970). Accordingly, the Court shall defer to the prison's policies and practices in granting Plaintiff access to his property while he is retained in Ad-Seg. However, Plaintiff shall be granted additional time in which to file a response to Defendants' motion to dismiss. Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: Plaintiff's request for a court order directing prison officials to return his legal materials 1. is DENIED; and 2. Plaintiff is GRANTED forty-five days from the date of service of this order in which to file a response to Defendants' motion to dismiss of May 17, 2010. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: October 6, 2010 /s/ Gary S. Austin UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE