

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GEORGE E. JACOBS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

JEANNE WOODFORD, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:08-cv-00369 AWI JLT (PC)

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S REQUEST
FOR A COURTESY COPY

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S REQUEST
FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE

(Doc. 32)

_____ /

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On June 15, 2011, Plaintiff filed a request for a copy of the findings and recommendations issued by the Court on April 26, 2011 (Doc. 26). Plaintiff explains that he never received a copy of the findings and recommendations and only realized that action had been taken in this case after inspecting the docket sheet. (Doc. 32 at 1.) Plaintiff argues that Defendant’s co-workers must be tampering with his legal mail, and therefore Plaintiff would like the Court to take judicial notice of that fact. (Id.) Plaintiff has attached several exhibits regarding this issue. (Id., Ex. A.)

The Court will provide Plaintiff with a courtesy copy of its findings and recommendations. As to Plaintiff’s request for judicial notice, the Court will deny that request. The matters for which Plaintiff seeks judicial notice are inappropriate, as they are neither “generally known” nor “capable of accurate and ready determination.” Fed. R. Evid. 201. The Court also notes that tampering of legal mail is not relevant to any of Plaintiff’s claims in this case.

1 Accordingly, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** that:

- 2 1. Plaintiff's request for a copy of the findings and recommendations issued April 26,
3 2011 is **GRANTED**;
- 4 2. Plaintiff's request for judicial notice is **DENIED**; and
- 5 3. The Clerk of the Court is instructed to send Plaintiff a courtesy copy of the Court's
6 April 26, 2011 findings and recommendations (Doc. 26).

7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: June 16, 2011

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE