## 

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TIMOTHY BERTRAM,

Plaintiff,

v.

C. SIZELOVE, et al.,

Defendants.

1:10cv00583 AWI DLB PC

ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

ORDER GRANTING IN PART MOTION TO STAY, AND STAYING DEFENDANTS' PENDING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT FOR 45 DAYS

(**Documents 110 and 111**)

Plaintiff Timothy Bertram ("Plaintiff") is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action filed on April 5, 2010. On April 2, 2012, the Court vacated the Findings and Recommendations regarding Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. Defendants' motion for summary judgment is therefore pending.

On April 12, 2003, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Stay the action and a Request for a Certificate of Appealability. In the Motion to Stay, Plaintiff explains that he believes that all rulings made by the Magistrate Judge previously assigned to this action were prejudicial and biased. Plaintiff believes that "this is why he was removed from the case." He requests that he be granted leave to appeal all pre-trial and discovery motions.

First and foremost, the reassignment of this action to Magistrate Dennis L. Beck was done pursuant to routine case management and did not occur because of Plaintiff's complaints to the Court.

Second, a request for an interlocutory appeal to review all orders issued in this action is not procedurally proper, or feasible. If Plaintiff wishes to challenge certain rulings, he may present his arguments to this Court by way of a Motion for Reconsideration pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil

Procedure 60(b)(6). If Plaintiff does so, he must specify the ruling(s) at issue and his arguments in support of his position. Finally, to allow Plaintiff time to file any such motions, the Court will stay Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment for 45 days. If Plaintiff does not file any motions for reconsideration during this time frame, the Court will rule on Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion to Stay this action is GRANTED IN PART. Plaintiff's request for a certificate of appealability is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **April 20, 2013** UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE