-BAM (PC) Glass	v. Woodford et al	Doc. 98
1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7		
8	DONALD GLASS,	) 1:09-cv-0098-AWI-BAM-PC
9	Plaintiff, v.	) ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
10	J. S. WOODFORD, et. al.,	) (Document #79)
11	Defendants.	
12		j –
13		
14	BACKGROUND	
15	Plaintiff Donald Glass is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil	
16	rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.	
17	On July 25, 2011, Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment.	
18	On August 12, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion for a continuance of the motion for	
19	summary judgment to allow Plaintiff additional time in which to conduct discovery. On September	
20	7, 2011, the court denied Plaintiff's motion for a continuance and directed Plaintiff to file an	
21	opposition within sixty days.	
22	On November 9, 2011, <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff filed a motion for an extension of time to file an opposition	
23	to the motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff asked for sixty additional days in which to file an	
24	opposition. On November 10, 2011, the Magistrate Judge granted Plaintiff thirty additional days to	
25		
26	The proof of service on this document is dated November 2, 2011, and the document is deemed filed as of this	
27	date pursuant to the prisoner mailbox rule. The court refers to the court's date of actual filing for consistency and because these are the dates reflected in the court's document.	
28	1	

file an opposition. On December 16, 2011,<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the court's November 10, 2011 order. Plaintiff states that additional time is needed because prison officials have Plaintiff's legal materials concerning this case and Plaintiff does not have access to them. In this motion, Plaintiff asks for sixty additional days to file his opposition. On February 23, 2012,<sup>3</sup> Plaintiff filed an opposition to the motion for summary judgment. On March 2, 2012, Defendants filed a reply brief addressing the opposition. **ORDER** Plaintiff has provided evidence that he needed additional time to file an opposition because he did not have his legal documents. Plaintiff has now filed his opposition. In the interests of justice, the court will grant Plaintiff's motion. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is granted and the court will consider Plaintiff's opposition brief. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: April 25, 2012 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE The proof of service on this document is dated December 10, 2011. The proof of service on this document is dated February 12, 2012.