

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAY MEDINA,

Plaintiff,

v.

J. CLARK KELSO, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:12-cv-01685-MJS (PC)

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
FOR CLARIFICATION

(ECF No. 6)

_____ /

Plaintiff Ray Medina (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

This action is proceeding on Plaintiff’s Complaint filed October 15, 2012. (ECF No. 1.) Plaintiff’s Complaint has not yet been screened.

On November 19, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion asking for clarification as to whether his motion for injunctive relief has been entered on the docket and whether his case is currently proceeding as a class action.. (ECF No. 6.)

Plaintiff’s motion for clarification is GRANTED. The requested clarification follows..

1 Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief has been entered on the docket at ECF No. 9.
2 The Court will address that motion in due course.

3 This action is not proceeding as a class action. Plaintiff is not an attorney, and he
4 is proceeding without counsel. . While a non-attorney proceeding pro se may bring his own
5 claims to court, he may not represent others. E.g., Simon v. Hartford Life, Inc., 546 F.3d
6 661, 664-65 (9th Cir. 2008); Fymbo v. State Farm Fire & Casualty Co., 213 F.3d 1320,
7 1321 (2000); Johns v. County of San Diego, 114 F.3d 874, 876 (9th Cir. 1997); C. E. Pope
8 Equity Trust v. United States, 818 F.2d 696, 697 (9th Cir. 1987). A pro se litigant simply
9 cannot "fairly and adequately protect the interests of the class." Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4);
10 Fymbo, 213 F.3d at 1321. Therefore, Plaintiff's request for class action certification is
11 denied.
12
13

14
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16
17 Dated: December 27, 2012

Isl. Michael J. Song
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE