

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

AHKEEM WILLIAMS,
Plaintiff,
v.
KIM PEDRIERO, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:12-cv-00606-SKO (PC)
ORDER ADDRESSING LETTER
(Doc. 118)

This case was dismissed, with prejudice, on October 17, 2014, and Plaintiff Akheem Williams' motion for reconsideration was denied, with prejudice, on October 27, 2014. On January 26, 2015, the Clerk's Office received a letter from Plaintiff regarding the status of his notice of appeal. The Clerk's Office was directed to file the letter so that the Court could address Plaintiff's inquiry regarding his appeal.

At no time has the Court received a notice of appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit from Plaintiff.

A letter sent by Plaintiff to a judge in the Sacramento Division of the Eastern District of California was forwarded to the Fresno Division Clerk's Office and brought to the Court's attention. In as much as that letter was addressed directly to a Sacramento Division judge and it requested he review the decisions made in this case, the letter was returned to Plaintiff by the Clerk's Office. To the extent that Plaintiff's accusation regarding mail tampering, presumably directed at Kings County Jail staff, refers to this letter, the letter was an attempt to communicate *ex*

1 *parte* with a judge in the Sacramento Division. *Ex parte* letters to judges are wholly improper, and
2 such letters are rejected and returned to the litigant. Under no circumstance is any redress
3 available to Plaintiff from a judge in the Sacramento Division nor does an improper *ex parte* letter
4 to a judge in Sacramento constitute a notice of appeal to the Ninth Circuit.

5 Accordingly, by this order, Plaintiff's letter is DEEMED ADDRESSED in its entirety.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: January 30, 2015

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28