

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

LEONARD RANSOM, JR.,
Plaintiff,
v.
DANNY HERRERA, et al.,
Defendants.

1:11-cv-01709-LJO-EPG (PC)

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO FILE A SUPPLEMENTAL
BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT
BRANNUM'S MOTION TO DISMISS
(ECF NO. 54)

Leonard Ransom, Jr. ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On July 7, 2016, defendant Brannum filed a motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 38). On September 1, 2016, the Court ordered Plaintiff to file an opposition or a statement of non-opposition to defendant Brannum's motion to dismiss within thirty days of the service of the order. (ECF No. 47). On September 12, 2016, Plaintiff filed a response to that order, stating that he never received a copy of defendant Brannum's motion to dismiss and asking for a copy of the motion. (ECF No. 49). On September 15, 2016, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting a copy of defendant Brannum's motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 50). On September 26, 2016, the Court granted Plaintiff's request for a copy of defendant Brannum's motion to dismiss, and gave Plaintiff thirty days to file an opposition or a statement of non-opposition to the motion. (ECF No. 51). On October 3, 2016, Plaintiff filed his opposition to

1 defendant Brannum's motion to dismiss. (ECF No. 52). On October 17, 2016, Plaintiff filed
2 what the Court construes as a motion to file a supplemental brief in opposition to defendant
3 Brannum's motion to dismiss ("the Motion"). (ECF No. 54).

4 According to the Motion, Plaintiff requests the opportunity to file a supplemental brief
5 in opposition to defendant Brannum's motion to dismiss because, upon further research,
6 Plaintiff noticed that he did not brief a case that is relevant to the Court's determination of the
7 motion to dismiss and that he briefed two cases that are not relevant. The Court finds good
8 cause to grant Plaintiff the opportunity to file a supplemental brief.

9 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

- 10 1. Plaintiff has thirty days from the date of the service of this order to file a
11 supplemental brief in opposition to defendant Brannum's motion to
12 dismiss;
- 13 2. Plaintiff's supplemental brief must state whether it is an additional brief,
14 or whether it is intended to replace the prior opposition he filed; and
- 15 3. Defendant Brannum has seven days from the date of the service of the
16 supplemental brief to file a reply to the supplemental brief.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.
18

19 Dated: October 19, 2016

20 /s/ Eric P. Gray
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26
27
28