

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**

RAYMOND ALFORD BRADFORD,)	Case No.: 1:14-cv-01689-LJO-BAM (PC)
Plaintiff,)	ORDER OVERRULING PLAINTIFF'S
v.)	OBJECTION TO COURT'S APRIL 2, 2018
M. MARCHAK, et al.,)	ORDER DENYING MOTIONS TO STRIKE
Defendants.)	[Doc No. 296]
)	
)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff Raymond Alford Bradford is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Currently before the Court is Plaintiff's objection to the Court's April 2, 2018 order denying his motions to strike. (ECF No. 296.) Plaintiff asserts that he properly objected to Defendant Grewal's filings made before that Defendant answered Plaintiff's complaint, and objects to the denial of his motions to strike Defendant Grewal's filings.

As discussed in this Court's March 29, 2018 order, before Defendant Grewal's answer was due, Plaintiff sought leave to amend his pleading. Defendant Grewal then sought an extension of time to answer until the Court determined whether Plaintiff would be granted leave to amend, to conserve resources. The Court found this to be good cause and granted Defendant Grewal's request. (ECF No. 256.) That Defendant Grewal continued to otherwise respond to Plaintiff's motions and defend the action while the Court determined whether Plaintiff would be granted leave to amend, was not

1 improper. Plaintiff did not present sufficient grounds to strike Defendant Grewal's filings, and the
2 Court finds no error in its prior determination to deny Plaintiff's motions to strike.

3 For these reasons, Plaintiff's objection (ECF No. 296) is HEREBY OVERRULED.
4

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: April 23, 2018

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28