## 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 BRYAN E. RANSOM, Case No. 1:13cv01779 AWI DLB (PC) 12 Plaintiff, ORDER DISREGARDING PLAINTIFF'S 13 MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME v. 14 M. McCABE, et al., (Document 11) 15 Defendants. 16 Plaintiff Bryan E. Ransom ("Plaintiff") is a prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis 17 in this civil rights action.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff filed this action on November 5, 2013. 18 On March 26, 2014, the Court screened Plaintiff's complaint and found that it stated certain 19 cognizable claims. The Court ordered Plaintiff to either amend his complaint or notify the Court of 20 his willingness to proceed only on the cognizable claims. In screening his complaint, the Court 21 determined that Plaintiff's due process and access to the courts claims were unrelated to the subject 22 matter of this action. 23 On May 1, 2014, Plaintiff filed a motion to extend time to file an amended complaint and an 24 "objection." The Court granted Plaintiff's request on May 6, 2014, but noted that an order requiring 25 objections had not issued and objections were therefore not warranted. 26 27

1

28

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Court order dated June 9, 2010, Plaintiff was deemed to be a prisoner with three strikes or more and therefore unable to proceed in forma pauperis. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). However, on December 19, 2013, the Court

determined that Plaintiff met the imminent danger exception for purposes of 1915(g).

On July 10, 2014, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint. Plaintiff chose to amend and the complaint is therefore awaiting screening. Also on July 10, 2014, Plaintiff filed a motion entitled, "Motion for Clarification of Objection." Plaintiff states that the "objection" he referenced in his request for an extension of time was actually an appeal. Plaintiff requested an extension of time to appeal the Court's March 26, 2014, order insofar as it dismissed the due process and access to courts claims. The March 26, 2014, order, however, is not an appealable order. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion is disregarded. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: **July 18, 2014** UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE