UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILSON GORRELL, Plaintiff, v. THOMAS SNEATH, et al., Defendants.	))))))))	Case No.: 1:12-cv-0554 - JLT ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE COURT'S ORDER (Doc. 69)

On March 14, 2013, Plaintiff Wilson Gorrell ("Plaintiff") filed a motion seeking clarification of the Court's order denying appointment of an expert. (Doc. 69). Plaintiff seeks information regarding the use of experts, and whether there is "some other way to satisfy the requirements for an expert witness without requiring their appearance in Court." *Id.* at 2. Specifically, Plaintiff requests that the Court "explain how he can call upon Dr. Price and/or Dr. Graham, and . . . accomplish the goal of permitting their opinions and assistance to be heard and included." *Id.*

Importantly, however, the Supreme Court has made clear that "judges have no obligation to act as counsel or paralegal to pro se litigants." *Pliler v. Ford*, 542 U.S. 225, 231 (2004). A litigant "does not have a constitutional right to receive personal instruction from the trial judge." *Id.* In addition, the the Constitution "require judges to take over chores for a pro se [litigant] that would normally be attended to by trained counsel as a matter of course." *Id.* (internal citations omitted); *see also Martinez v. Court of Appeal of Cal., Fourth Appellate Dist.*, 528 U.S. 152, 162 (2000).

While the Court recognizes the challenges Plaintiff faces as a pro se litigant, offering the specific information requested by would undermine the judge's role as an impartial decision-maker. *See Plier*, 542 U.S. at 231. Accordingly, Plaintiff is referred to the Federal Rules of Evidence 702-705 and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26, which govern the use of experts and the submission of their testimony for the Court's consideration. Plaintiff's motion for clarification is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **July 19, 2013**

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE