



1 The Court's January 18, 2013, screening order did not include an analysis of Plaintiff's  
2 claims. Rather, because there were no claims to dismiss, the Court simply found that Plaintiff  
3 stated a First Amendment claim for denial of access to the courts and ordered Plaintiff to return  
4 service documents.

5 Reviewing his complaint, there appear to be three instances where he alleges a denial.  
6 While Defendants' motion for summary judgment addressed two, it did not address Plaintiff's  
7 claim that he was denied access during the time a motion for reconsideration could have been  
8 filed in the Ninth Circuit. Plaintiff alleges that this resulted in an untimely motion for  
9 reconsideration. ECF No. 1, at 25-27.  
10

11 Therefore, in light of the lack of specificity in the screening order, the Court finds that  
12 permitting Defendants additional time to bring a pretrial dispositive motion on the remaining  
13 third claim would be the best use of the Court's and parties' resources.

14 Accordingly, the Court GRANTS Defendants sixty (60) days from the date of service of  
15 this order within which to bring a pretrial dispositive motion on the remaining access to courts  
16 claim. Plaintiff's opposition shall be due within thirty (30) days of the date of service of any  
17 motion, and a reply, if any, will be due within fourteen (14) days.  
18

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: August 13, 2014

21 /s/ Dennis L. Beck  
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28