## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAWRENCE PEPE CARDOZA,

Plaintiff,

VS.

M. TANN, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:11-cv-01386-RRB

## ORDER RE: MOTION AT DOCKETS 131

At **Docket 131** Defendants F. Carreon, P. Paz, and R. Pinkham requested clarification as to the Order Re: Motions at Dockets 92 and 97.<sup>1</sup> The Court addressed the matter raised in the motion in its Order Regarding Motions at Dockets 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, and 117.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, Defendants Paz, Carreon, and Pinkham's Request for Clarification as to Order Re: Motions at Dockets 92 and 97 is **DENIED** as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 23rd day of October, 2015.

S/ RALPH R. BEISTLINE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

<sup>1</sup> Docket 129.

<sup>2</sup> Docket 132.

ORDER RE DOCKET 31 Cardoza v. Tann, 1:11-cv-01386-RRB – 1