

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**

JEAN-PIERRE K. THOMAS,	)	Case No.: 1:08-cv-0689 – JLT (PC)
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	ORDE R DISREGARDING PLAINTIFF’S TRIAL
	)	EXHIBITS AND EXHIBIT LIST
M.P. GARCIA, et al.,	)	(Doc. 203)
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

Plaintiff Jean-Pierre K. Thomas (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* in a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On July 16, 2013, Plaintiff submitted a copy of his trial exhibits in an effort to comply with the Court’s pretrial order. (Doc. 203). Also in compliance with the pretrial order, Plaintiff has properly labeled his exhibits and paginated the document accordingly. Id.

Nonetheless, a comparison of Plaintiff’s newly presented trial exhibits and exhibit list (Doc. 203) and the exhibits listed in his pretrial statement (Doc. 151) and provided at that time, reveals that the exhibits contained in these documents are not identical.<sup>1</sup> While the Court appreciates Plaintiff’s

---

<sup>1</sup> By way of illustration, Plaintiff’s Exhibit 3 – or Exhibit C – as presented in his pretrial statement contains: (1) an inmate request for an interview, (2) Plaintiff’s initial classification record, (3) four pages of Defendant Bonilla’s response to request for production of documents, and (4) two crime incident reports from the October 5, 2006, incident. (Doc. 151 at 37-47). On the other hand, Plaintiff’s Exhibit 3 as presented in his trial exhibits and exhibit list, contains: (1) five pages of

1 efforts to comply with the pretrial order, the use of Plaintiff's newly presented trial exhibits (Doc. 203)  
2 would lead to confusion.<sup>2</sup>

3 Accordingly, the Court **DISREGARDS** Plaintiff's newly presented trial exhibits and trial list.  
4 (Doc. 203). Defendants have agreed to provide the Court and Plaintiff with copies of Plaintiff's  
5 exhibits contained in his pretrial statement (Doc. 151). Therefore, the exhibits contained in Plaintiff's  
6 pretrial statement **SHALL** be Plaintiff's operative list at the trial on this matter.

7  
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: July 17, 2013

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  

---

26 Defendant Bonilla's response to request for production of documents, (2) inmate request for review, (3) Plaintiff's  
classification, (4) Plaintiff's CDCR Form 602, dated October 15, 2006, and (5) two crime incident reports related to the  
October 5, 2006 incident. (Doc. 203 at 13-25).

27 <sup>2</sup> This confusion is compounded by the fact the Court has issued an extensive order related to Defendants' motion  
28 in limine #1 which discusses Plaintiff's Exhibits 1 through 18. To renumber and reorder them now, for no apparent reason,  
would make managing the exhibits unwieldy.