

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

MICHAEL D. HARRISON,

Plaintiff,

v.

T. MOORE, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:08-cv-1065-AWI-MJS (PC)

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
FOR A SCHEDULING ORDER (ECF No.
243)**

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1983. The action proceeds on Plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment claims against numerous defendants. (ECF No. 160.)

On June 5, 2015, Plaintiff moved for a “new scheduling Order [to] be put in place,” so that Plaintiff would have additional time to serve Defendants. (ECF No. 243.) The Court will deny this motion.

Of the remaining unserved defendants, Defendants have been ordered to provide more information about Zakari, Bastianon, Edmonds and Raygoza (ECF No. 238),

1 service has been reattempted on Johnson (ECF No. 245), and Campos has already
2 been dismissed (ECF Nos. 236 & 244). The Court anticipates that service issues will be
3 resolved without the necessity of changing longstanding case deadlines.

4 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion to compel (ECF No. 243) is DENIED.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: June 17, 2015

/s/ Michael J. Seng
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28