1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9	ROBERT A. VON VILLAS,	Case No. 1:13-cv-01869-LJO-JLT (PC)
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S
11	v.	MOTION REQUESTING CLARIFICATION
12	PALLARES, et al.,	(Doc. 17)
13	Defendants.	
14		
15		
16	Plaintiff, Robert A. Von Villas, is a state prisoner who is currently proceeding pro se in	
17	this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed this action on November 18,	
18	2013. (Doc. 1.) On July 28, 2014, Plaintiff filed a document entitled "Notice Advising Court	
19	Defendants filed Motion of Removal, Request for Screening Order, and Request for Extension of	
20	Time to Respond Under Different Case Number." (Doc. 10.) That document was construed as a	
21	motion by Plaintiff requesting that judicial notice be taken in this case that he filed a notice of	
22	objection to a defense notice of removal and requested both a screening order and an extension to	
23	respond in Von Villas v. Pallares, E.D. Case No. 1:14-cv-01063-LJO-GSA ¹ (hereinafter	
24	"Plaintiff's Other Action") which was denied on October 8, 2014 (hereinafter "the October 8th	
25	Order"). (Doc. 15.)	
26	On October 22, 2014, Plaintiff filed a document entitled "Motion Requesting	
27	1	
28	¹ Case No. 1:14-cv-01063-LJO-GSA was recently dismissed as duplicative of this action.	
		1
		1

1 Clarification" in which he states that he received the October 8th Order, but that he "never filed 2 said motion," believed the motion was filed by the Attorney General's Office, that he filed an 3 objection to the Attorney General's motion, and now seeks clarification. (Doc. 17.) To the extent 4 this order is able to do so, Plaintiff's motion requesting clarification is granted.

It appears that Plaintiff has confused the separateness/exclusivity of his multiple actions in 5 this Court. 6

The October 8th Order issued in response to the document that Plaintiff filed in this action 7 which was entitled "Notice Advising Court Defendants filed Motion of Removal, Request for 8 Screening Order, and Request for Extension of Time to Respond Under Different Case Number" 9 (hereinafter "Plaintiff's Motion for Notice"). (Doc. 10.) In Plaintiff's Motion for Notice, which 10 was only two sentences long, it appeared that Plaintiff was requesting the Court in this action: (1) 11 to take judicial notice in this action of the notice of removal that the defendants filed in Plaintiff's 12 Other Action; (2) to issue a screening order in Plaintiff's Other Action; and (3) to issue an 13 extension of time for Plaintiff to respond in Plaintiff's Other Action. These are the three issues 14 that were addressed in the October 8th Order. 15

It appears from Plaintiff's Motion Requesting Clarification, that when he filed Plaintiff's 16 Motion for Notice, Plaintiff was merely attempting to bring the circumstances in Plaintiff's Other 17 Action to the attention of the Court in this action and did not actually desire this Court to take 18 judicial notice of anything in his Other Action, nor did he desire an order from this Court in this 19 action in any way. If this was Plaintiff's desire, he was remiss in filing it as documents of any sort 20 (including those filed in other actions) should only be filed in an action when necessary, such as 21 "in connection with a motion for summary judgment, trial or the Court requests otherwise." (See 22 Doc. 3, First Info O, 3:8-13.) There are only an extremely limited number of circumstances 23 where filings in two separate actions are relevant to each other - none of which apply here.² 24 Plaintiff is urged to refrain from filing documents in this action other than motions seeking Court 25 orders, or in opposition/response thereto, or as directed to do so by the Court.

26

²⁷ ² Plaintiff's actions have neither been consolidated, nor found to be related; rather, they were found to be duplicative such that Plaintiff's Other Action has been dismissed. 28

1	Plaintiff has filed his First Amended Complaint (see Doc. 16) which is in line for
2	screening. Plaintiff need do nothing else until the First Amended Complaint has been screened
3	and an order thereon has issued.
4	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, to the extent accomplished by this order,
5	Plaintiff's Motion Requesting Clarification, filed October 22, 2014 (Doc. 17), is GRANTED.
6	
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.
8	Dated: October 30, 2014 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
9	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	3