| 1 | | |
|----------|--|--|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATI | ES DISTRICT COURT |
| 9 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | JEFFREY P. PERROTTE, | Case No.: 1:15-cv-00026-LJO-SAB (PC) |
| 12 | Plaintiff, | ORDER DENYING AS MOOT PLAINTIFF'S |
| 13 | v.) | MOTION FOR A COURT ORDER TO SERVE DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY |
| 14 | STACEY JOHNSON, et al., | JUDGMENT AND GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO |
| 15 | Defendants. | FILE AN OPPOSITION |
| 16 |) | [ECF Nos. 86, 87, 88, 89] |
| 17 | Plaintiff Jeffrey P. Perrotte is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action | |
| 18 | pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. | |
| 19 | On June 22, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting the Court order Defendants to serve a | |
| 20 | copy of their motion for summary judgment filed on May 5, 2017. On this same date, Defendants | |
| 21 22 | filed an opposition to Plaintiff's motion. | |
| 22 | On July 20, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion for an extension of time to file an opposition to | |
| 23 | Defendants' pending motion for summary judgment. On July 20, 2017, Defendants filed an opposition. | |
| 25 | On May 5, 2017, Defendants Stacey Johnson and Jean LeFlore filed a motion for summary | |
| 26 | judgment. On June 1, 2017, Defendants filed a declaration in lieu of a reply because Plaintiff did not | |
| 27 | file an opposition. | |
| 28 | | |
| | | 1 |

Ш

| 1 | In his June 20, 2017, motion, Plaintiff contends that he never received a copy of Defendants' | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | motion for summary judgment. Defendants submit and attached a proof of service to the motion for | |
| 3 | summary judgment demonstrating that Plaintiff was properly served at his address of record. (ECF | |
| 4 | Nos. 79, 81-85, 87.) Defendants further submit that on June 20, 2017, at the request of Plaintiff, they | |
| 5 | forwarded Plaintiff a courtesy copy of the motion for summary judgment on. | |
| 6 | In his July 20, 2017, motion, Plaintiff indicates that he has now received a copy of Defendants' | |
| 7 | motion for summary judgment and requests an extension of time to file an opposition. | |
| 8 | Although the record does support Defendants' contention that their motion for summary | |
| 9 | judgment was properly served on Plaintiff at his address of record, given that Plaintiff is proceeding | |
| 10 | pro se and is incarcerated, the Court will grant Plaintiff an extension of time to file an opposition to | |
| 11 | Defendants' pending motion for summary judgment. | |
| 12 | Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that: | |
| 13 | 1. Plaintiff's motion for a court order providing him a copy of Defendants' motion for | |
| 14 | summary judgment is denied as moot; and | |
| 15 | 2. Plaintiff is granted thirty days from the date of service of this order to file an opposition | |
| 16 | to Defendants' motion for summary judgment. | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 19 | Dated. July 21, 2017 | |
| 20 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |