1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 GEORGE E. JACOBS, IV, Case No. 1:10-cv-02349-AWI-JLT (PC) ORDER DENYING JUDICIAL NOTICE AND 12 Plaintiff, STRIKING PLAINTIFF'S "STATUS REPORT" FROM THE DOCKET IN THIS CASE 13 v. (Doc. 38) 14 QUINONES, et al 15 Defendants. 16 Plaintiff, George E. Jacobs, IV, is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma 17 pauperis, in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 which he filed on December 13, 18 19 2010. On November 12, 2013, Plaintiff filed a document entitled "Status Report Concerning 20 Defendant T.L. Williams." (Doc. 38.) In this status report, Plaintiff states that he wants "... the Court to take notice that on November 2 and 3rd, 2013 Plaintiff was physically escorted to the 21 recreation yard (4B Yard S.H.U. 4 Right Housing Unit) by Defendant T.L. Williams. When 22

Housing Unit on the 4 B yard to assist 4 Right Housing Unit guards with their yard recall program." (*Id.*) Plaintiff does not ask for any specific action by the Court other than notice be taken. (*Id.*)

recreation yard time was completed [he] further noticed Defendant T.L. Williams exit 4 Left

23

24

25

26

27

28

"A judicially noticed fact must be one not subject to reasonable dispute in that it is either (1) generally known within the territorial jurisdiction of the trial court or (2) capable of accurate

and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned." Fed. R. Evid. 201(b); *United States v. Bernal Obeso*, 989 F.2d 331, 333 (9th Cir. 1993). Plaintiff's status report is his recounting of events as he experienced them. It does not contain facts that are generally known within this Court's territorial jurisdiction, nor are the facts within it capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned. Judicially noticeable facts are items such as the National Weather Service's recorded weather on a specific date in a specific location, or court records. *See Colonial Penn Ins. Co. v. Coil*, 887 F.2d 1236, 1239 (4th Cir. 1989); *Mullis v. United States Bank. Ct.*, 828 F.2d 1385, 1388 n.9 (9th Cir. 1987); *Rodic v. Thistledown Racing Club, Inc.*, 615 F.2d 736, 738 (6th. Cir. 1980); *Valerio v. Boise Cascade Corp.*, 80 F.R.D. 626, 635 n. 1 (N.D. Cal.1978), aff'd, 645 F.2d 699 (9th Cir.). Plaintiff's status report is not judicially noticeable just because he filed it in this action. It is nothing more than a declaration by a party to an action, which is not something that can be judicially noticed.

If Plaintiff filed his status report hoping to preserve or edify his rendition of events, he did so in error as the First Informational Order in this case notes that the Court cannot serve as a repository for the parties' evidence, that he may not file evidence with the Court until the course of litigation brings the evidence into question, and that evidence improperly submitted to the court will be returned or stricken. (*Id.*, at p. 4.) If Plaintiff feels that the events he has detailed in his letter have amounted to a violation of his constitutional rights, his recourse is to file another action.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's request for judicial notice in his "Status Report Concerning Defendant T.L. Williams," filed November 12, 2013 (Doc. 38), is DENIED and the document is HEREBY STRICKEN.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **November 18, 2013**

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE