

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 MARK SOKOLSKY,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

1:13-cv-02044-LJO-GSA-PC

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
REQUEST FOR MORE DEFINITIVE
ANSWER AS MOOT
(ECF No. 44.)

17 Plaintiff is a civil detainee proceeding *pro se* in a civil rights action pursuant to 42
18 U.S.C. § 1983. This case now proceeds on Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, filed on
19 February 4, 2016, against defendants Domrese, King, Meek, Porter, and Bonsu for denial of
20 free exercise of religion under the First Amendment and violation of RLUIPA; and defendants
21 Domrese, King, Porter, and Bonsu for violation of due process for conditions of confinement.
22 (ECF No. 44.) On May 31, 2016, Defendants King, Coyne, and Porter filed an Answer to the
23 Second Amended Complaint. (ECF No. 40.)

24 On July 11, 2016, Plaintiff filed a request for the court to compel defendants King,
25 Coyne, and Porter to file a more definitive Answer to the Second Amended Complaint. (ECF
26 No. 44.)

27 Plaintiff's motion is moot because on July 21, 2016, defendants King, Coyne, Porter,
28 Meek, and Bonsu filed an Amended Answer to the Second Amended Complaint. (ECF No.

1 46.) Because the Amended Answer supercedes the prior Answer filed on May 31, 2016,
2 Plaintiff's request for Defendants to update the prior Answer is moot and shall be denied as
3 such. Fed. R. Civ. P. 15; Local Rule 220.

4 Accordingly, based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's
5 request for a more definitive answer, filed on July 11, 2016, is DENIED as moot.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: October 27, 2016

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE