1		
2		
3		
<u>4</u>		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
9		
10	TOMMIE LEE BAKER,	CASE NO. 1:14-cv-01020-AWI-MJS (PC)
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER DIRECTING DEFENDANT TO
12	V.	RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO DISMISS
13	J. ALVA, et al.,	(ECF No. 26)
14 15	Defendants.	FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE
14 15 16		FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE eding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil
15	Plaintiff is a state prisoner procee	
15 16	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceer rights action brought pursuant to 42	eding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil
15 16 17	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceer rights action brought pursuant to 42	eding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil U.S.C. § 1983. The action proceeds against nd O'Daniels on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment
15 16 17 18	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceer rights action brought pursuant to 42 Defendants Alva, Mendoza, Franco, ar failure to protect claim. (ECF Nos. 11 & 1	eding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil U.S.C. § 1983. The action proceeds against nd O'Daniels on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment
15 16 17 18 19	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceer rights action brought pursuant to 42 Defendants Alva, Mendoza, Franco, ar failure to protect claim. (ECF Nos. 11 & 1 On March 13, 2015, Plaintiff filed	eding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil U.S.C. § 1983. The action proceeds against nd O'Daniels on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment 3.)
15 16 17 18 19 20	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceer rights action brought pursuant to 42 Defendants Alva, Mendoza, Franco, ar failure to protect claim. (ECF Nos. 11 & 1 On March 13, 2015, Plaintiff filed	eding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil U.S.C. § 1983. The action proceeds against nd O'Daniels on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment 3.) a motion to dismiss the action with prejudice on
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceer rights action brought pursuant to 42 Defendants Alva, Mendoza, Franco, ar failure to protect claim. (ECF Nos. 11 & 1 On March 13, 2015, Plaintiff filed the ground he no longer has any dispu- Court. (ECF No. 26.)	eding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil U.S.C. § 1983. The action proceeds against nd O'Daniels on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment 3.) a motion to dismiss the action with prejudice on
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceer rights action brought pursuant to 42 Defendants Alva, Mendoza, Franco, ar failure to protect claim. (ECF Nos. 11 & 1 On March 13, 2015, Plaintiff filed the ground he no longer has any disput Court. (ECF No. 26.) Where a defendant has appeared	eding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil U.S.C. § 1983. The action proceeds against and O'Daniels on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment 3.) a motion to dismiss the action with prejudice on a with Defendants requiring resolution by the
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceed rights action brought pursuant to 42 Defendants Alva, Mendoza, Franco, and failure to protect claim. (ECF Nos. 11 & 1 On March 13, 2015, Plaintiff filed the ground he no longer has any disput Court. (ECF No. 26.) Where a defendant has appeared dismiss the action only by stipulation s	eding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil U.S.C. § 1983. The action proceeds against and O'Daniels on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment 3.) a motion to dismiss the action with prejudice on the with Defendants requiring resolution by the d in the action by filing an answer, Plaintiff may
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceer rights action brought pursuant to 42 Defendants Alva, Mendoza, Franco, ar failure to protect claim. (ECF Nos. 11 & 1 On March 13, 2015, Plaintiff filed the ground he no longer has any dispu- Court. (ECF No. 26.) Where a defendant has appeared dismiss the action only by stipulation s court order on terms the Court deems p	eding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil U.S.C. § 1983. The action proceeds against and O'Daniels on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment 3.) a motion to dismiss the action with prejudice on the with Defendants requiring resolution by the d in the action by filing an answer, Plaintiff may igned by all parties who have appeared or by
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceer rights action brought pursuant to 42 Defendants Alva, Mendoza, Franco, ar failure to protect claim. (ECF Nos. 11 & 1 On March 13, 2015, Plaintiff filed the ground he no longer has any dispu- Court. (ECF No. 26.) Where a defendant has appeared dismiss the action only by stipulation s court order on terms the Court deems p have filed an answer. (ECF No. 19.) No s	eding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil U.S.C. § 1983. The action proceeds against and O'Daniels on Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment 3.) a motion to dismiss the action with prejudice on the with Defendants requiring resolution by the d in the action by filing an answer, Plaintiff may igned by all parties who have appeared or by proper. Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a). Here, Defendants

1	they oppose dismissal as proposed. The motion will be held under submission pending	
2	Defendants' response.	
3		
4	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
5	Dated: <u>April 7, 2015</u> Isl Michael J. Seng	
6	Dated: <u>April 7, 2015</u> UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	2	
	۷۲	