v.

COUNTY OF FRESNO, et al.,

2 3 4

1

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

DANIEL TREBAS, CASE NO. 1:12-cv-00978-SAB (PC)

> Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STAY ACTION

(ECF No. 12)

Defendants.

Plaintiff Daniel Trebas ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On December 26, 2012, Plaintiff filed a first amended complaint. (ECF No. 6.) On February 21, 2013, Plaintiff filed a motion for leave to amend his complaint and lodged a second amended complaint. (ECF Nos. 8 & 9.) The Court granted Plaintiff's motion and filed Plaintiff's second amended complaint on February 26, 2013. (ECF Nos. 10 & 11.) On March 11, 2013, Plaintiff filed a motion to stay the action "pending resolution of the defendant's barriers imposed on plaintiff." (ECF No. 12.)

Currently pending before the Court is Plaintiff's second amended complaint. The Court is required to screen complaints brought by prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). Once the complaint is screened and found to have stated a cognizable claim against any defendant, a copy of the complaint will be sent to Plaintiff with service documents to be completed and returned. Thus, at this time there are no pending deadlines for Plaintiff to require a stay or any extension of time. Once Plaintiff's complaint is screened, all court deadlines will be strictly enforced. Requests for time

extensions must state the reason the extension is needed and must be filed with the court before the deadline in question. Local Rule 144; First Informational Order ¶ 10.

Further, the Court will not order Plaintiff's mail to be forwarded. A pro se plaintiff has an affirmative duty to keep the Court and opposing parties apprised of his or her address. Local Rule 182(f); First Informational Order ¶ 11.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for a stay, filed March 11, 2013, is HEREBY DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: <u>March 19, 2013</u>

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE