UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DIST	RICT OF CALIFORNIA
RAYMOND BALDHOSKY ,	CASE NO. 1:12-cv-01200-MJS (PC)
Plaintiff,	ORDER DISCHARGING ORDER TO
V.	
SUSAN HUBBARD, et al.,	(ECF No. 43)
Defendants.	ORDER SETTING BRIEFING SCHEDULE ON DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS
	(ECF Nos. 40 and 53)
	<b>OPPOSITION DUE WITHIN THIRTY (30)</b>
	DAYS
	REPLY DUE SEVEN (7) DAYS THEREAFTER
Plaintiff is a former state prisone	er proceeding pro se in this civil rights action
brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.	
On August 29, 2016, Defendants	Gonzalez, Metts, and Kaylor filed a motion to
dismiss. (ECF No. 40.) On August 30, 2	2016, the Court ordered defense counsel to file
further briefing and appear at a hearing	g to show cause why sanctions should not be
imposed for filing a motion that identifie	d no grounds for reconsideration of the Court's
	1
	EASTERN DIST RAYMOND BALDHOSKY , Plaintiff, v. SUSAN HUBBARD, et al., Defendants. Plaintiff is a former state prison brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On August 29, 2016, Defendants dismiss. (ECF No. 40.) On August 30, 2 further briefing and appear at a hearing

1	screening order. (ECF No. 43.) Plaintiff was instructed not to respond to Defendants'
2	motion absent further order of the Court.

3	Defense counsel filed supplemental briefing (ECF No. 47) and appeared at a
4	hearing on October 7, 2016. (ECF No. 52.) Defense counsel was invited to submit
5	supplemental briefing on issues discussed at the hearing, and she was given ten days to
6	do so. (Id.) Her brief was filed October 17, 2016. (ECF No. 53.)

Arguments presented at the hearing and in defense counsel's supplemental brief
are sufficient to persuade the Court that the motion to dismiss was not brought in bad
faith. Accordingly, sanctions will not be imposed, and the order to show cause is
HEREBY DISCHARGED.

Additionally, the Court sets the following schedule for further briefing on
Defendants' motion to dismiss:

1. Plaintiff may file an opposition within thirty days of the date of this order;

2. Defendants may file a reply within seven days of Plaintiff's opposition; and

3. Absent further order of the Court, no surreply is permitted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: <u>October 26, 2016</u>

Ist Michael V. Sena

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE