

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
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM THOMAS COATS,
Plaintiff,
v.
CHAUDHRI, et al,
Defendants.

1:13-cv-02032-AWI-BAM (PC)

ORDER REQUIRING DEFENDANTS TO
RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
STAY

(ECF No. 82)

TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE

Plaintiff William Thomas Coats (“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 proceeds against Defendants Fairchild, Gundran, Gladden, Nguyen, and Convalecer for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment.

On July 10, 2018, the Court granted Defendants’ motion for more definite statement and directed Plaintiff to file a first amended complaint clarifying the allegations in the original complaint regarding the Defendants. (ECF No. 78.) After no response was received, the Court issued an order to show cause why this action should not be dismissed for Plaintiff’s failure to comply with the Court’s order and for failure to prosecute. (ECF No. 81.)

On September 10, 2018, Plaintiff filed a response. (ECF No. 82.) Plaintiff states that on August 7, 2018, he was placed on “suicide watch mental psych hold.” On August 13, 2018,

1 Plaintiff was removed from Los Angeles County Prison (“LAC”) on a psychiatric hold and taken
2 to the California Medical Facility in Vacaville, California, where Plaintiff remains housed. All of
3 Plaintiff’s property, including his legal work, remains at LAC. Plaintiff states that he will be
4 permitted access to his property when he is released from acute care to an extended care psych
5 facility, but there is no set time for this to occur. Plaintiff states that he does not want his case to
6 be dismissed with prejudice, but he does not know how to proceed. Plaintiff requests an
7 extension of time of three to six months, if possible. (Id.)

8 The Court construes Plaintiff’s response as a motion for a stay of this action, and finds it
9 appropriate to obtain a response from Defendants regarding the motion. Accordingly, Defendants
10 shall file a response to Plaintiff’s motion, (ECF No. 82), within **twenty-one (21) days** from the
11 date of this order.

12
13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: October 2, 2018

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE