

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

ERIC CHARLES RODNEY K’NAPP,)	1:06-cv-01701-LJO-GSA-PC
Plaintiff,)	ORDER DENYING MOTION
vs.)	FOR STAY
)	(Doc. 61.)
D. G. ADAMS, et al.,)	ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION OF
)	TIME TO FILE OBJECTIONS
Defendants.)	SIXTY DAY DEADLINE

Eric Charles Rodney K’napp (“Plaintiff”) is a prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed the original complaint on November 22, 2006. (Doc. 1.) On November 17, 2010, Plaintiff filed a motion to stay this action. (Doc. 61.)

Plaintiff requests a temporary stay of all further proceedings in this action for at least two months, until sometime after he has been transferred to his next prison location, given back his personal property, afforded meaningful access to the law library, and otherwise allowed a fair, sufficient, and uninterrupted period of time to work on meeting his upcoming legal deadlines in his multiple state and federal court cases. Plaintiff asserts that he suffers a medically verified writing impairment and requires access to a word-processing personal typewriter. Plaintiff also explains that he suffers from mental health conditions and difficulty sleeping, reading, and concentrating.

1 The Court does not lightly stay litigation, due to the possibility of prejudice to defendants.
2 Plaintiff's only pending deadline in this action is to file objections to the court's findings and
3 recommendations of August 23, 2010. Although the court recognizes that Plaintiff is challenged by his
4 disabilities, prison conditions, and the litigation of multiple actions, the Court finds that a stay is not
5 a proper remedy under the circumstances. In the alternative, and good cause appearing, Plaintiff shall
6 be granted additional time to meet his pending case deadline to file objections. Should Plaintiff require
7 a further extension of time, he should file a motion before the current deadline expires.

8 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 9 1. Plaintiff's motion to stay this action, filed on November 17, 2010, is DENIED;
- 10 2. Good cause appearing, Plaintiff is GRANTED an extension of time to file objections;
11 and
- 12 3. Within sixty days of the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall file objections to the
13 findings and recommendations issued by the court on August 23, 2010.

14
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 **Dated: November 19, 2010**

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28