

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**

BARRY LOUIS LAMON,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DERRAL ADAMS, et al.,

Defendants.

1:09-cv-205 LJO SMS (PC)

ORDER DENY PLAINTIFF’S MOTION  
FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

(Doc. 162)

CLERK’S OFFICE TO SEND PLAINTIFF  
A COPY OF THE DOCKET AND THE  
ORDER AT DOC. 159 IN THIS CASE

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Plaintiff is a prisoner proceeding pro se in a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On May 1, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking issuance of a protective order insulating him from any sanctions that might attach if he is unable to timely respond to orders issued by this court, or to documents served on him by Defendants. (Doc. 162.) The basis for Plaintiff’s request is that he has recently been transferred between several prisons and his receipt of mail is delayed with each transfer such that he is not always aware of, nor able to engage in, action that he must take in a timely manner. (Id.)

However, while an anticipated lapse of a deadline due to delay in Plaintiff’s receipt of mail or personal effects is good cause to grant an extension of time for action, even on a nunc pro tunc basis, it is not good cause to provide blanket protection to a party from any and all sanctionable action, or inaction, in any given case. Further, Plaintiff’s motion is premature in

1 as much as the Court is unaware of any sanctionable event with which a deadline has lapsed  
2 with which Plaintiff has failed to comply. If Plaintiff is unable to meet a deadline in this action  
3 for which some form of sanction would apply, Plaintiff may file appropriate documents seeking  
4 relief which will be individually considered. Extensions of time are regularly granted upon  
5 showing of good cause.

6 Further, Plaintiff indicates that he has not received any orders issued in this case since  
7 his March 8, 2012 transfer. It is thus appropriate to provide him with a copy of the order, Doc.  
8 159, which granted his request for an extension of time to respond to Defendants' discovery.

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for a protective order is  
10 denied, without prejudice, as premature. Further, the Clerk's Office is ordered to serve Plaintiff  
11 with a copy of the docket in this case and a copy of the order which issued April 11, 2012,  
12 granting Plaintiff's first motion for an extension of time to file responses to discovery nunc pro  
13 tunc (Doc. 159) along with this order.

14  
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 **Dated:** May 2, 2012

/s/ Sandra M. Snyder  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28