UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DARRELL JUNIOR LESCALLETT, Plaintiff, v. R. DIAZ, et al., Defendants.	1:13-cv-01342-LJO-BAM (PC) ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART MOTION FOR STATUS ON CASE AND EXTENSION OF TIME (ECF No. 26)

Plaintiff Darrell Junior Lescallett ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action currently proceeds on Plaintiff's claims for retaliation in violation of the First Amendment against Defendants Gipson, Broomfield and Doe Defendants.

On February 10, 2016, Plaintiff filed the instant motion for a status on his case and for an extension of time. (ECF No. 26.) Plaintiff requests a status of this case and an extension for anything currently due. He also requests a copy of the rules for the court.

Regarding the case status, the Court reminds Plaintiff that a discovery and scheduling order was issued on September 28, 2015 and served by mail on Plaintiff, setting forth rules, procedures, and deadlines with which the parties must comply. (ECF No. 22.) That order specifically set the following still-pending deadlines: deadline for amending the pleadings is **March 28, 2016**; deadline for completion of all discovery, including filing all motions to compel discovery, is **May 28, 2016**; and the deadline for filing all dispositive motions (other than a

motion for summary judgment for failure to exhaust) is **August 08, 2016**. There are no other pending deadlines in this matter. Plaintiff is further reminded that any request for an extension of any deadline must be filed on or before the expiration of the deadline in question and will only be granted on a showing of good cause. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). Plaintiff's generic request for an extension for anything due is denied.

Regarding Plaintiff's request for a copy of the rules of the court, Plaintiff is reminded that a First Information Order was issued in this case on October 4, 2013, and served on him by mail. (ECF No. 5.) That Informational Order stated that the parties must comply with the Informational Order, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and the Local Rules of the United States District Court, Eastern District of California ("Local Rules"), as modified by the Informational Order. (Id. at 1.) The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules are generally available via a law library. The Court does not provide full copies of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the Local Rules. Plaintiff's request for a copy of the rules of the court is therefore denied.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for status of case and extension of time is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. The general status of the case is as explained above, but Plaintiff's requests for an unspecified extension of time and for a copy of the rules of the court are denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **February 12, 2016**

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE