

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

ROBIN DASENBROOK,	)	Case No.: 1:11-cv-01884 DAD DLB PC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b>ORDER REGARDING DEFENDANTS’</b>
	)	<b>REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION</b>
vs.	)	[ECF No. 183]
	)	
A. ENENMOH, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

---

Plaintiff Robin Dasenbrook (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1983. This action is proceeding against Defendants Enenmoh, Page, Perez, and Adair for claims of negligence and deliberate indifference to a serious medical need in violation of the Eighth Amendment.

On September 11, 2013, the Court issued a Discovery and Scheduling Order. At the time, not all Defendants had appeared in this action. On May 9, 2014, Defendants Enenmoh and Page filed a motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff filed an opposition on June 12, 2014, and Defendants filed a reply on July 14, 2014. On September 17, 2014, in light of the re-opening of discovery as to additional defendants, the Court dismissed the motion without prejudice to re-filing.

1 On June 24, 2016, the Court issued a second Discovery and Scheduling Order concerning  
2 the two additional Defendants, Adair and Perez.

3 On July 1, 2016, Defendants Enenmoh and Page filed a request for clarification regarding  
4 their motion for summary judgment that had been previously dismissed. Defendants ask that in  
5 the interest of judicial economy the Court to reinstate their motion for summary judgment now  
6 that the issue of unidentified defendants has been resolved. Good cause appearing therefore,  
7 Defendant's motion for summary judgment will be reinstated.

8 **ORDER**

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' motion is GRANTED, and  
10 the motion for summary judgment dated May 9, 2014, is REINSTATED along with Plaintiff's  
11 opposition and Defendants' reply. The deadlines set forth in the second Discovery and  
12 Scheduling Order of June 24, 2016, concerning Defendants Adair and Perez remain the same.

13  
14  
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: July 6, 2016

17 /s/ Dennis L. Beck  
18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28