

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DENISA DIXON,

 Plaintiffs,

 v.

BPD OFFICERS WESBROOK, et al.,

 Defendant.

Case No.: 1:11-cv-01290 AWI JLT

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
CONTINUANCE

(Doc. 14)

On November 17, 2011, Plaintiff filed a “Notice of Motion and Motion to Request Judicial Notices.” (Doc. 14) Inexplicably, this motion was not acted on by the Court at that time. Review of the motion appears to reveal that Plaintiff is not truly seeking to have the Court take judicial notice of any facts.¹ Instead, it appears to be an analysis by Plaintiff of her belief that Defendants’ defenses lack merit.

///
///
///
///

¹ In any event, as the Court advised Plaintiff in its order dated March 19, 2012 (Doc. 30), a request for judicial notice is not appropriate at this time.

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

Because Plaintiff has no motion pending that would require the introduction of evidence that would authorize the Court to take judicial notice of any fact, the motion for judicial notice is **DENIED.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 1, 2012

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE