

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

RICKEY ADAMS,		CASE NO. 1:10-cv-671-AWI-MJS (PC)
Plaintiff,		ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR
v.		DEFAULT
		(ECF No. 8)
J. YATES, et al.,		AND GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION
Defendants.		FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND
		_____ / (ECF No. 1)

Plaintiff Rickey Adams ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Before the Court is Plaintiff's Request for Entry of Default [ECF No. 8] asking the Court to enter default against Defendants based on their failure to answer or otherwise respond to his complaint. Defendants have filed an opposition to this Motion.

In conjunction with their Notice of Removal, Defendants asked the Court to delay their time for responding to the Complaint until after the Court had screened the Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(A).¹ The filing of this motion and the Defendants' opposition to the instant motion indicates that Defendants intend to defend against this action. Thus, default is inappropriate. Even if the Court were to enter default, it could easily be set aside. See Knox v. Woodford, 2010 WL 19567839, *1 (E.D. Ca. May 14, 2010).

Accordingly, Plaintiff's Request for Entry of Default [ECF No. 8] is DENIED.

¹ Defendants are advised that they should file their motion for extension of time to respond separately from their notice of removal in the future.

1 Defendant's Motion for Extension of Time to Respond [ECF No. 1] is GRANTED.
2 Defendants shall respond to Plaintiff's Complaint not later than thirty days after the Court
3 enters its screening order, if any claims are found cognizable.

4

5

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: July 15, 2010

/s/ Michael J. Seng
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