UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EDWARD DEMERSON, CASE NO. 1:08-cv-00144-LJO-SKO PC

Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING MOTION

v. (Docs. 92 and 93)

JEANNE S. WOODFORD, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Edward Demerson, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on January 29, 2008. Pursuant to the Court's order filed June 22, 2010, this action is proceeding on Plaintiff's second amended complaint against Defendants Phillips, Campos, Amaro, Clausing, Bardonnex, Munoz, and Cartagina for using excessive physical force against Plaintiff and against Defendants Munoz, Cartagina, Gregory, and Hillard for deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's serious medical needs. Defendants Amaro, Bardonnex, Campose, Cartagena, Clausing, Munoz, and Philips sought an extension of time to file a response to Plaintiff's second amended complaint on June 2, 2011, and the request was granted. However, Defendants Gregory and Hillard did not join in the request or make a separate appearance, and on June 8, 2011, the Court ordered them to show cause why default should not be entered against them.

On June 13, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion which the Court construes as seeking an order requiring Defendants' counsel to assist the United States Marshal in serving Defendants Gregory and Hillard. When Plaintiff drafted and served his motion, he was not yet in receipt of the Court's order

to show cause. The status of service on Defendants Gregory and Hillard will be resolved in accordance with the applicable law, and the issue is being addressed by the Court. Defendants' counsel is not obligated to act on behalf of parties he does not represent and in light of the pending order to show cause, nothing further is required of Plaintiff at this juncture. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion is HEREBY DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. /s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE Dated: <u>June 15, 2011</u>