

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

CHRISTOPHER HARBRIDGE,	)	Case No. 1:10-cv-00473 AWI JLT (PC)
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR
vs.	)	CORRECTION
	)	(Doc. 12)
JAMES A. YATES, et al.,	)	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
Defendants.	)	ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
	)	(Doc. 13)

On January 14, 2011, the Court issued an order denying Plaintiff’s motion under Rule 60 and ordered that his first amended complaint be dismissed with leave to amend. (Doc. 11) Plaintiff correctly notes that the caption of the Court’s order erroneously named the wrong person as the lead defendant. (Doc. 12) The Court grants the request to correct the order and the corrected order is filed herewith. Notably, this corrected order allows Plaintiff 45 days—rather than the 30 days previously ordered—to amend his complaint or notify the Court that he will proceed with cognizable claims outlined in the order.

Also, Plaintiff seeks 90 days time in which to object to the Court’s order. (Doc. 13) Plaintiff indicates that he wishes to file a Rule 72 motion, however, this motion does not apply to the Court’s order. Moreover, the Court’s order granted Plaintiff leave to amend. Thus, no final order or recommendation has made to the District Judge related to Plaintiff’s case. Instead, Plaintiff’s current

1 options are as set forth in the corrected order issued this date. Therefore, this request is **DENIED**.

2

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 Dated: January 27, 2011

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28