

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

EDIN A. CHACON,	)	1:11-cv-01689-GSA-PC
Plaintiff,	)	
vs.	)	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR COURT ORDER GRANTING ACCESS TO LAW LIBRARY
J. CERRINI, et al.,	)	(Doc. 15.)
Defendants.	)	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
	)	(Doc. 18.)

Edin A. Chacon ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On November 23, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion for a court order providing him with access to the law library. (Doc. 15.) On March 22, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion for an extension of time. (Doc. 18.)

**I. MOTION FOR ACCESS TO LAW LIBRARY**

Plaintiff seeks a court order directing prison officials to provide him with access to the law library during the pendency of this action. The court recognizes that prison administrators "should be accorded wide-ranging deference in the adoption and execution of policies and practices that in their judgment are needed to preserve internal order and discipline and to maintain institutional security." Whitley v. Albers, 475 U.S. 312, 321-322 (1986) (*quoting* Bell v. Wolfish, 441 U.S. 520, 547 (1970)).

1 Accordingly, the court shall defer to the prison's policies and practices in granting access to the law  
2 library. Moreover, Plaintiff does not presently require access to the law library to comply with court  
3 orders in this action. Therefore, Plaintiff's motion shall be denied.

4 **II. MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

5 Plaintiff also seeks a court order granting him an extension of time, establishing a deadline in  
6 this action to enable him to obtain Priority Legal Use status at the prison and gain access to the law  
7 library. As discussed above, the Court shall not issue an order directing prison officials to allow Plaintiff  
8 access to the law library. Plaintiff does not require an extension of time in this action at this time,  
9 because there are no court deadlines currently pending in this action. Therefore, Plaintiff's motion shall  
10 be denied.

11 **III. CONCLUSION**

12 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 13 1. Plaintiff's motion for a court order enabling him to gain access to the law library, filed  
14 on November 23, 2011, is DENIED; and
- 15 2. Plaintiff's motion for extension of time, filed on March 22, 2012, is DENIED.

16  
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 **Dated: June 15, 2012**

/s/ Gary S. Austin  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28