1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JUAN MATIAS TORRES,) Case No.: 1:14-cv-00492-DAD-SAB (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER REGARDING DEFENDANTS' REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION AND STRIKING PORTION OF MAY 23, 2016 ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST TO FILE A REPLY TO DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF'S
13	V.	
14	RALPH M. DIAZ, et al.,	
15	Defendants.) OBJECTIONS
16) [ECF No. 145]
17	Plaintiff Juan Matias Torres is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action	
18	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.	
19	On June 3, 2016, Defendants filed a request for clarification of the Court's May 23, 2016,	
20	order granting Plaintiff an extension of time to re-submit his objections to the pending findings and	
21	recommendations and reply to Defendants' response to Plaintiff's objections. (ECF No. 142.)	
22	On May 23, 2016, the Court granted Plaintiff's request to submit amended objections and a	
23	reply to Defendants' response to Plaintiff's objections, which were both separately filed on May 20,	
24	2016. (ECF Nos. 139, 140, 141.) Inasmuch as the Court inadvertently granted Plaintiff's request to	
25	submit a reply (not authorized by the Local Rules) to Defendants' response to their objections that	
26	///	
27	///	
28	///	
	1	

portion of the Court's May 23, 2016, is stricken. Local Rule 304(b), (d). This ruling rightfully does not foreclose the district judge's consideration of Plaintiff's reply to Defendants' response to the objections should justification for filing a reply be found.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **June 6, 2016**

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

July S. Be