

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**

<p>VIRGIL E. HOLT,</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">Plaintiff,</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">v.</p> <p>R. NICHOLAS, et al.,</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">Defendants.</p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p>Case No.: 1:09-cv-00800-AWI-SAB (PC)</p> <p>ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR COURT ORDERED STATUS UPDATE AS MOOT</p> <p>[ECF No. 113]</p>
--	---	---

Plaintiff Virgil E. Holt is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Now pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion for a court ordered status update. In his motion, Plaintiff requests the status the Findings and Recommendations which were issued on February 12, 2013.

On September 27, 2013, in the light of the procedural posture of the case, the District Judge declined to adopt the Findings and Recommendation, denied Defendants’ motion for summary judgment without prejudice to re-filing, and directed Plaintiff to either file a new motion to compel discovery responses, or inform the Court that a motion to compel is no longer necessary.

On October 23, 2013, Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration of the September 27, 2013, order granting Defendants the opportunity to file a second motion for summary judgment.

On October 28, 2013, Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration was denied.

1 On October 30, 2013, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel the Defendants to produce and provide
2 discovery. (ECF No. 118.)

3 Inasmuch as the Court has ruled on the Findings and Recommendation dated February 12,
4 2013, Plaintiff's motion for the Court to provide a status update is DENIED as MOOT.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: November 13, 2013



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28