



1 In response, defendants have submitted evidence, in the form of docket sheets from  
2 the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California, showing that plaintiff  
3 has filed a number of cases in that court and that three of those cases, including the instant  
4 matter, are still pending. In particular, defendants note that in one of the pending cases,  
5 Armstrong v. Garcia, et al., 2:08-cv-00039 FCD KJM, plaintiff recently filed a request for  
6 an extension of time and access to a typewriter in order to oppose the defendants'  
7 dispositive motions, defendants responded thereto, and, on March 16, 2010, the court found  
8 that, based on plaintiff's prolific hand-written filings in that matter, plaintiff had the ability  
9 to file opposition to defendants' dispositive motions without the use of a typewriter.  
10 Accordingly, the court denied plaintiff's request to order prison officials to provide him with  
11 a typewriter and ordered plaintiff to file his oppositions within thirty days. (Defs.' Resp. at  
12 3:14-25 & Ex. 8.)

13 Similarly, in the instant case, plaintiff has filed, in the past nine months, numerous  
14 motions and, as defendants note, he has not shown that he has requested a reasonable  
15 accommodation for a medical disability from prison officials, specifically, a typewriter.


16 Based on the foregoing, plaintiff's request for access to a typewriter to prepare his  
17 opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment is hereby DENIED.

18 Within **forty-five (45)** days of the date this order is filed plaintiff shall file his  
19 opposition to defendants' motion. Defendants shall file a reply within **twenty (20)** days of  
20 the date plaintiff's opposition is filed.

21 No further extensions of time will be granted absent a showing of extraordinary  
22 circumstances.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 DATED: March 26, 2010

25   
26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 WILLIAM H. ALSUP  
28 United States District Judge