

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

DANA MCMASTER,
Plaintiff,
v.
M. E. SPEARMAN, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:10-cv-01407-AWI-SKO PC
ORDER DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT
TO FILE LETTER AND SEND PLAINTIFF
COPY OF DOCKET, AND ADDRESSING
LETTER

Plaintiff Dana McMaster, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on August 6, 2010. On October 28, 2013, the Clerk of the Court received a letter from Plaintiff. Based on its contents, the Court elects to file the letter and it is addressed as follows.

The Clerk of the Court shall send Plaintiff of the docket. However, Plaintiff is not entitled to a free copy of the Local Rules. If the prison's law library lacks a copy, the librarian may call to obtain a copy for use by all litigants. The current version of the Local Rules was effective October 1, 2013.

With respect to Plaintiff's substantive discovery motions, Plaintiff may be aware that the Eastern District of California carries one of the heaviest caseloads in the country and suffers from a shortage of judges. If not, he is now so informed. Plaintiff has not been precluded from filing

1 motions, as he asserts. However, as with every other litigant, he is required to await rulings on his
2 substantive motions, which will occur in due course.¹

3 Plaintiff's assertion regarding expedited handling of Defendants' motions is without merit.
4 Defendants have sought extensions of time to serve discovery responses, which have been granted.
5 Fed. R. Civ. P. 6. Plaintiff has not sought similar extensions of time. Had he done so, his
6 motions, too, would have been granted. Substantive motions such as those filed by Plaintiff are
7 not resolved in the same manner as motions for extensions of time of the type filed by Defendants.
8 Plaintiff may be assured that the Court is aware of his pending discovery motions, which will be
9 resolved in due course.

10
11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: October 29, 2013

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

¹ Plaintiff's most recent motion to compel is not yet ready consideration. Local Rule 230(l).