1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ANDREW A. CEJAS,	Case No. 1:12-cv-00271-AWI-DLB PC
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO JOIN OPPOSITIONS
13	v.	(Document 162)
14	MYERS, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16	Plaintiff Andrew A Caiss ("Plaintiff") is	a California state prisoner proceeding pro se and in
17 18	Plaintiff Andrew A. Cejas ("Plaintiff") is a California state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauparis in this givil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. & 1083. This action is proceeding on	
18 19	forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action is proceeding on Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint for violation of the First Amendment against numerous	
20	Defendants.	
20	Defendants' January 11, 2016, motions for summary judgment are pending. ¹	
22	On March 16, 2016, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting that his oppositions to the two	
23	motions be joined, as he believes that the facts overlap and support each motion. Defendants Foston,	
24	Van Leer and Pimentel opposed the motion on March 24, 2016. The Court deems the matter	
25	suitable for decision without additional briefing.	
26		
27		
28	¹ There are seven Defendants in this action, though they are not represented by the same counsel. Defendants Myers, Trimble, McGee and Fisher are represented by Janine K. Jeffrey. Defendants Foston, Van Leer and Pimentel are represented by Shanan L. Hewitt. As a result, there are two separate motions for summary judgment.	

1	Given that there are two separate motions for summary judgment, and that both motions	
2	appear fully briefed, the Court will not join Plaintiff's oppositions at this time. Plaintiff's request to	
3	join the oppositions was made after Defendants Foston, Van Leer and Pimentel filed their reply, and	
4	joining the oppositions would deprive those Defendants of addressing issues raised in Plaintiff's	
5	other opposition. Moreover, Plaintiff has filed <i>numerous</i> documents in opposition to both motions,	
6	from February 22, 2016, through March 23, 2016. Any consolidation of his oppositions would add	
7	confusion to briefing that is already somewhat complicated.	
8	For these reasons, Plaintiff's motion is DENIED.	
9		
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
11	Dated: March 30, 2016 /s/ Dennis L. Beck	
12	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	