

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

JOHN RAY DYNES,

1:08-cv-00136-GSA-PC

Plaintiff,

ORDER RESOLVING PLAINTIFF’S MOTIONS

v.

(Docs. 91, 92, 94, 95, 97.)

C/O JUAN MEDINA and  
C/O DAVID WILLIAMS,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**I. Background**

This is a civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by Plaintiff John Ray Dynes, a prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis. Plaintiff is currently incarcerated at the Fresno County Jail. This action is proceeding on Plaintiff’s amended complaint, filed April 24, 2008, against Defendants Juan Medina and David Williams for use of excessive physical force, in violation of the Eighth Amendment. Plaintiff’s claim arises from an incident which occurred while he was incarcerated at Kern Valley State Prison. This matter is set for jury trial on April 14, 2010.

Plaintiff filed five self-described motions between February 25, 2010 and March 1, 2010, concerning pretrial matters. (Docs. 91, 92, 94, 95, 97.)

1 **II. Motion seeking information about pretrial orders (Doc. 91.)**

2 On February 25, 2010, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting information and instructions for  
3 filing a pretrial order. The court finds no good cause to provide such information to Plaintiff.  
4 Plaintiff is not required to prepare or file a pretrial order and, in fact, the pretrial order for this  
5 action was filed by the court on March 4, 2010. Therefore, this motion shall be denied.

6 **III. Motions regarding “argument packet and exhibits” (Docs. 92, 97.)**

7 On February 26, 2010, and again on March 1, 2010, Plaintiff filed motions for leave to  
8 use his “argument packet and exhibits,” filed on January 26, 2010, as arguments and evidence at  
9 trial. Plaintiff is advised to refer to the court’s pretrial order which governs the claims and  
10 defenses to be tried and the exhibits allowed at trial. These motions are thus resolved.

11 **IV. Motions requesting definitions of legal terms (Docs. 94, 95.)**

12 On February 26, 2010, and again on March 1, 2010, Plaintiff filed motions for the court  
13 to provide him with definitions of various legal terms. These motions shall be denied. Plaintiff  
14 is advised to refer to the Local Rules of the Eastern District of California for such information. A  
15 copy of the Local Rules should be available to Plaintiff at the Fresno County Jail where he is  
16 presently incarcerated.

17 **V. Conclusion**

18 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 19 1. Plaintiff’s motion seeking information about pretrial orders, filed on February 25,  
20 2010, is DENIED;
- 21 2. Plaintiff’s motions regarding his “argument packet and exhibits,” filed on  
22 February 26, 2010, and March 1, 2010, are RESOLVED; and
- 23 3. Plaintiff’s motions requesting definitions of legal terms, filed on February 26,  
24 2010, and March 1, 2010, are DENIED.

25  
26 IT IS SO ORDERED.

27 **Dated: March 4, 2010**

**/s/ Gary S. Austin**  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE