

1 himself.” Johns v. County of San Diego, 114 F.3d 874, 877 (9th Cir. 1997) (quoting C. E. Pope
2 Equity Trust v. United States, 818 F.2d 696, 697 (9th Cir. 1987)).

3 The Court take judicial notice under Federal Rule of Evidence 201 of the California State Bars
4 website at www.calbar.ca.gov, and upon search of such website Brandon Favor is not licensed by the
5 California State Bar to practice law in the state, nor does Mr. Favor provide a state bar licensing
6 number on the motion. In addition, the Court has searched the website of the Cochran Law Firm in
7 Los Angeles, California, at www.cochranfirm.com, and Brandon Favor is not listed as an attorney
8 employed with the firm. Moreover, the Court is familiar with the standard of work produced by the
9 Cochran Law Firm, and the instant motion filed on January 5, 2017, is quite subpar to such standard.
10 The Court takes further judicial notice of the fact that Brandon Alexander Favor, listed as a witness to
11 attend the jury trial in the instant case, is an inmate incarcerated in the California Department of
12 Corrections and Rehabilitation under inmate number G-60488, presently incarcerated at California
13 Correctional Institution in Tehachapi, California. See www.cdcr.ca.gov. (inmate locator).
14 Furthermore, the Court recognizes that Brandon Favor has been filing cases and/or documents on
15 behalf of other inmates in cases pending in this Court. See [Brandon Favor v. People of State of](#)
16 [California](#), E.D. Cal. Case No. 1:16-cv-01922 MJS (HC), ECF No. 2 (noting “Favor is well known to
17 this court. Since 2013, he has filed at least sixteen habeas petitions and seven § 1983 complaints in
18 the Eastern District of California as well as filing additional petitions and complaints in the Central
19 and Southern Districts of California. See [Dickerson v. Vasquez](#), E.D. Cal Case No. 1:16-cv-1889-
20 DAD-SKO, ECF No. 10.)

21 Because Mr. Favor has improperly filed the instant motion for the attendance of incarcerated
22 on behalf of Plaintiff, who is appearing pro se, the Court must deny the motion, without prejudice.
23 Both Plaintiff and Mr. Favor are admonished against improperly filing documents with the Court,
24 which may result in the document being stricken from the record.

25 Further, to the extent that such an improper filing is attributable to the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff is
26 admonished that this conduct may be deemed admissible impeachment evidence against him at trial.
27 However, the court reserves any ruling unless and until the matter is raised in a motion in limine.
28

1 Further, a copy of this order along with the initial filing shall be served by the Clerk of the
2 Court on the State Bar of California, Unauthorized Practice of Law Section, and the Cochran Law
3 Firm in Los Angeles, California.

4 IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Incarcerated Witnesses is denied without
5 prejudice.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: February 8, 2017



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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