1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 3 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 4 ROBERTO A. SOTELO, CASE NO. 1:08-cv-01342-LJO-SKO PC 5 Plaintiff, ORDER CONTINUING DEFENDANTS' 6 MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT FROM COURT'S CALENDAR UNTIL v. 7 MOTION IS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO T. BIRRING, et al., LOCAL RULE 230 8 Defendants. (Doc. 41) 9 10 On January 25, 2011, Defendants Birring and Das filed a motion for summary judgment. 11 Subsequently, the Court appointed counsel to represent Plaintiff and a scheduling conference is set 12 for October 27, 2011. On July 26, 2011, the Court ordered Defendants to file a notice either 13 withdrawing their motion pending further scheduling or stating their intent to stand by their motion 14 as filed. On August 5, 2011, Defendants notified the Court that they do not wish to withdraw their 15 motion and they intend to stand by the motion as is. 16 Accordingly, in light of 28 U.S.C. § 476(a)(1), the Civil Justice Reform Act, Defendants' 17 motion for summary judgment is ORDERED CONTINUED from the Court's calendar until 18 Plaintiff's opposition is filed and the motion is submitted pursuant to Local Rule 230.¹ 19 20 IT IS SO ORDERED. 21 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Dated: August 9, 2011 22 23 24 25 26 27 A deadline for opposing the motion will be set during the scheduling conference. This order is solely 28

administrative and nothing is required of the parties.