

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PUNAOFO TSUGITO TILEI

Plaintiff,

v.

T. WAN, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:06-cv-00776-OWW-GSA PC

ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR
ISSUANCE OF RULING ON LETTERS TO
CLERK’S OFFICE, ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT
C

(Doc. 78)

ORDER DIRECTING CLERK’S OFFICE TO
PROVIDE PLAINTIFF WITH A COPY OF
THE DOCKET FOLLOWING THE
DOCKETING OF THIS ORDER

On January 8, 2010, Plaintiff filed a request, in letter form, seeking the issuance of an order ruling on his motions, attached as Exhibit C. (Doc. 78, court record p. 4.) Exhibit C consists of two letters to the Clerk of the Court, dated November 15, 2009, and November 26, 2009, by Plaintiff.

Letters to the Clerk of the Court are not motions, and do not and will not receive orders in response. Further, as Plaintiff was properly notified by the Clerk’s Office, the Clerk is unable to respond to individual inquiries on case status. Although Plaintiff asserts that he is not seeking a case status, his inquires in fact constitute a request for case specific information and are considered status inquiries. The Clerk’s Office is unable to respond to such inquiries.

If Plaintiff wishes to seek relief via an order on a matter relating to this case, he must file a motion with the court. Letters to the Clerk of the Court are not motions, as previously stated, and will not receive court rulings. Therefore, Plaintiff’s request for a ruling on his letters to the Clerk’s Office, attached as Exhibit C, is **HEREBY ORDERED DENIED**.

1 In light of the Plaintiff's concern regarding his reply dated October 22, 2009, Plaintiff is
2 informed that his reply to Defendants' opposition to his motion to compel responses to his
3 interrogatories, and his reply to Defendants' opposition to his motion to compel responses to his
4 request for the production of documents have been received and filed.¹ (Docs. 67, 75.) Therefore,
5 Plaintiff's four motions to compel have been deemed submitted, and are currently being reviewed
6 on their merits by the undersigned. A ruling will be issued in due course.

7
8
9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 **Dated: January 20, 2010**

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 ¹ On December 3, 2009, Plaintiff sent a letter to the Clerk of the Court regarding his reply to Defendants'
26 opposition to his motions to compel responses to his interrogatories. The letter was accompanied by a copy of the
27 reply, dated October 22, 2009. Upon inquiry from the Clerk's Office, the Court directed that the reply be filed in,
28 reflected in docket entry 75. The Court also directed that the letter be filed in simply for the purpose of clarifying
the circumstances under which the reply was received and filed on December 3, 2009. (Doc. 74.) It is not clear why
the reply was not received along with Plaintiff's other reply date October 22, 2009. (Doc. 67). The Court accepts
Plaintiff's representation that it was mailed on October 22, 2009, and the reply will be considered when the Court
issues its ruling on Plaintiff's motions to compel. The Court will not further address this issue.