

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KENNETH ROBERT HUSKEY,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.  
PAM AHLIN, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 1:09-cv-01576 AWI JLT (PC)

ORDER DIRECTING DEFENDANT TO FILE  
AN ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST  
AMENDED COMPLAINT'S CLAIM AS TO  
DEFENDANT LASLEY

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Plaintiff is a civil detainee prisoner proceeding pro se and *in forma pauperis* with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On March 29, 2010, Plaintiff filed his First Amended Complaint. (Doc. 8.) By order filed January 3, 2011, the Court adopted the findings and recommendation which recommended certain claims be dismissed but allowed Plaintiff to proceed on his Fourteenth Amendment claims and associated state law claims as to Defendants Lasley and Pham. (Doc. 12.) On June 3, 2011, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss. (Doc 21.) On June 27, 2011, Plaintiff filed his opposition. (Doc. 22.)

On November 21, 2011, the Court granted Defendant's motions to dismiss as to Defendant Pham, but provided Plaintiff with leave to file a second amended complaint or alternatively proceed only as to his claims against Defendant Lasley. (Doc. 25.) On December 9, 2009, Plaintiff notified the Court that he wished to proceed only on the claim as to Defendant Lasley found cognizable by the Court's

1 November 21, 2011 order.<sup>1</sup> (Doc. 27.) Thus, this action will proceed only on Plaintiff's claim against  
2 Defendant Lasley.

3 Accordingly, Defendant is **HEREBY ORDERED** to answer Plaintiff's First Amended  
4 Complaint's claim as to Defendant Lasley, within 20 days of the date of this order.

5

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: December 13, 2011

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
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

---

<sup>1</sup>The Court notes its November 21, 2011 Order had misspelled Defendant Kyle Lasley last name as "Laskey." (Doc. 25 at 1.) Plaintiff notice that he intended to proceed as to the claim against Defendant Lasley, (at Doc. 27), similarly misspelled Defendant Lasley's last name. Nevertheless, it is clear that Plaintiff intends to proceed only as to his claim as to Defendant Lasley. (Doc. 27.)