

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

10 THOMAS L. GOFF,  
11 Plaintiff,  
12 v.  
13 GAMEZ, et al.,  
14 Defendants.  
15

Case No. 1:15-cv-00937-AWI-EPG (PC)  
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S REQUESTS  
FOR MISCELLANEOUS RELIEF  
(ECF NO. 101)

16 Thomas Goff ("Plaintiff") is a former state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma*  
17 *pauperis* in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action was  
18 dismissed for failure to prosecute on November 8, 2019. (ECF Nos. 89 & 90). Plaintiff  
19 appealed on December 9, 2019. (ECF Nos. 91, 92, & 93).

20 On January 10, 2020, Plaintiff filed a letter to the Court. (EF No. 101, pgs. 6-8). In the  
21 letter, Plaintiff states that he is currently at San Luis Obispo County Jail. Plaintiff alleges that  
22 the Jail has a "non existing physical law library." It does have a "Legal Research Associates"  
23 department, but there is no staff to answer questions or provide materials. Plaintiff further  
24 alleges that he requested "PLU-Status" in compliance with Jail policy, but was told that only a  
25 judge could deem him *pro-se*. Plaintiff is still unable to obtain legal materials.  
26  
27  
28

1 Plaintiff requests: 1) A Court order directing the Jail to recognize his § 1983 case<sup>1</sup> and  
2 his appeal to the Ninth Circuit as legitimate legal needs, with a copy of the order being sent to  
3 the Facility Captain; 2) A copy of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure; and 3) That he be  
4 allowed to proceed *in forma pauperis* in Appeal No. 19-17494.

5 All three of Plaintiff's requests will be denied. Plaintiff's first and second requests  
6 appear to relate to Plaintiff's allegation that he is not being provided with adequate law library  
7 access, which is preventing Plaintiff from obtaining the legal materials he needs to prosecute  
8 his case(s). However, this case is closed, and Plaintiff has appealed. If Plaintiff believes he is  
9 being prevented from pursuing other case(s), or his appeal of the dismissal of this case, he may  
10 file a new case based on the allegations in the letter<sup>2</sup> or file an appropriate motion in the  
11 action(s) that are ongoing or with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

12 As to Plaintiff's third request, it will be denied as moot. Plaintiff was granted *in forma*  
13 *pauperis* in this case, and the Court already ordered that "Plaintiff is entitled to proceed *in*  
14 *forma pauperis* in Appeal No. 17474" (ECF No. 99, p. 2).

15 Accordingly, based on the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's miscellaneous  
16 requests for relief are DENIED.

17  
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: January 13, 2020

20 /s/ Eric P. Gray  
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 \_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff has at least one other active § 1983 case.

<sup>2</sup> The Court is not taking a position on the merits of any such action.