1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 ROBERT BISHOP, Case No.: 1:11-cv-00094-SAB (PC) 12 Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S REQUESTS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE 13 v. [ECF Nos. 14 KELLY HARRINGTON, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 Plaintiff Robert Bishop is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action 17 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. 18 19 On August 10, 2015, August 14, 2015, and September 11, 2015, respectively, Plaintiff filed 20 requests for judicial notice of several documents, including correspondence to defense counsel, inmate 21 grievances, inmate request for interview forms, and request for correspondence forms. (ECF Nos. 61, 63, 70.) 22 23 Rule 201 of the Federal Rules of Evidence permits a court to take judicial notice of any facts 24 which may be "accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be 25 questioned." Fed. R. Evid. 201(b) and (d). However, a Court may only take judicial notice of facts 26 contained in a state agency's records where the facts are not subject to a reasonable dispute." <u>Brown</u> 27 v. Valoff, 422 F.3d 926, 931 n. 7 (9th Cir. 2005).

28

First, Plaintiff does not provide any basis other than the attachment of documents to the motion to support a finding of judicial notice, and the Court cannot determine the relevancy of the documents. Second, the Court will not take judicial notice of documents in a vacuum and these documents are not the type of adjudicative facts that are judicially noticeable. <u>See</u> Fed. R. Evid. 201. Accordingly, Plaintiff's requests for judicial notice are DENIED.

TIT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **September 16, 2015** 

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE