

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

ANTHONY JOSEPH SANCHEZ,	CASE NO. 1:07-cv-00128-LJO-SMS PC
Plaintiff,	ORDER STRIKING NOTICE
v.	(Doc. 60)
STANCLIFF, et al.,	ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR THIRTY-
Defendants.	DAY EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
	RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
	(Doc. 61)

Plaintiff Anthony Joseph Sanchez (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 5, 2009, Plaintiff filed a document entitled “Plaintiff’s Notice of Specific Dates of Events and Other Previously Unknown Information.” The information set forth in the notice was apparently obtained by Plaintiff through discovery. Plaintiff may not simply add facts or evidence to the record piecemeal. Plaintiff cites no legal authority in support of the submission and the notice is not a legally recognizable filing. Therefore, the notice is **HEREBY ORDERED STRICKEN** from the record.

On January 20, 2009, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking a second extension of time to file a response to the Court’s order directing him to show cause why Defendant Lindini should not be dismissed from this action for failure to provide information sufficient for the United States Marshal to effect service of process. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). Plaintiff’s motion is **HEREBY ORDERED**

///
///

1 GRANTED and Plaintiff shall have **thirty (30) days** from the date of service of this order within
2 which to file a response to the order to show cause.

3

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 **Dated:** January 23, 2009

/s/ Sandra M. Snyder
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28