

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

TIMOTHY CRAYTON,  
Plaintiff,

No. C 08-00621 WHA (NJV) (PR)

v.

**ORDER RE PLAINTIFF'S VERIFIED  
OBJECTION AND MOTION RE THE  
DECEMBER 13 STIPULATION**

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER  
A. HEDGEPEETH, et al.,  
Defendants.

On December 23, plaintiff Timothy Crayton filed a "verified objection and motion to nullify, void, and strike the purported 12/13/13 stipulation" (Dkt. No. 275). Mr. Crayton appears to believe that the December 13 stipulation (Dkt. No. 265) is "an agreement that allows defense counsel to re-open dispositive motion proceedings and allow . . . 'any procedural motion that Defendant believes is appropriate based on the exhaustion issue . . .'" The verified objection and motion requests a hearing "on the issue of pro bono representation" and a stay of proceedings. The Court requests that appointed counsel for plaintiff please confer promptly with Mr. Crayton regarding this verified objection and motion. On December 13, defendants filed a motion to dismiss for failure to exhaust administrative remedies, noticed for January 16 (Dkt. No. 268). Plaintiff can certainly file an opposition should he so choose. The Court would appreciate it if plaintiff's counsel would please file a response by **JANUARY 6 AT NOON** regarding whether Mr. Crayton intends to withdraw this verified objection and motion, or what relief he requests to be heard on.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: December 24, 2013.

  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California