

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

11 MARK S. SOKOLSKY,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16
17

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

**ORDER FOR DEFENDANTS TO
RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S
OBJECTIONS WITHIN FOURTEEN
DAYS**

(ECF No. 71.)

18 Plaintiff is a civil detainee proceeding *pro se* in a civil rights action pursuant to 42
19 U.S.C. § 1983. This case now proceeds on Plaintiff's Second Amended Complaint, filed on
20 February 4, 2016, against defendants Domrese, King, Meek, Porter, and Bonsu ("Defendants")
21 for denial of free exercise of religion under the First Amendment and violation of RLUIPA;
22 and defendants Domrese, King, Porter, and Bonsu for violation of due process for conditions of
23 confinement. (ECF No. 30.) On March 30, 2017, Defendants filed a motion for summary
24 judgment, which is pending. (ECF No. 68.)

25 On April 24, 2017, Plaintiff filed a document titled "Plaintiff's Objection to Rand
26 Warning (Objection)," in which Plaintiff asserts that he has not been served with the motion for
27 summary judgment. (ECF No. 71.) The court shall require a response to the Objection by
28 Defendants, addressing service of the motion for summary judgment.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that within fourteen days of the date of service of this order, Defendants shall file a response to Plaintiff's Objection of April 24, 2017.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **May 4, 2017**

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE