

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

SCOTT K. RICKS,	)	1:15-cv-01147-AWI-BAM (PC)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF’S
	)	THIRD MOTION FOR EXPLANATION OF
v.	)	LEGAL TERMINOLOGY AND
	)	PROCEDURES
A. AUSTRIA, et al.,	)	
	)	(ECF No. 38)
Defendants.	)	

Plaintiff Scott K. Ricks (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action is related to Ricks v. Onyeye, et al., 1:15-cv-1148-AWI-BAM, and Ricks v. Levine, et al., 1:15-cv-1150-AWI-BAM. This matter was referred to the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

Currently before the Court is Plaintiff’s third motion for an explanation of legal terminology and proceedings. (ECF No. 44.) Plaintiff filed his first and second motions related to this issue in the Ricks v. Levine, et al., 1:15-cv-1150-AWI-BAM action.

Plaintiff’s contentions and relief requested in this motion are substantially identical to the contentions and requests in his second motion for an explanation of legal terminology and proceedings that was filed in the Levine matter. That is, Plaintiff contends that he lacks law library access and writing and mailing materials, and requests information on complying with discovery and print-outs of any case law, rules, and terminology referenced in any court documents.

1 The Court issued an order denying Plaintiff's second motion for an explanation of legal  
2 terminology and proceedings in the Levine matter on January 12, 2017. (Case No. 1:15-cv-  
3 01150-AWI-BAM, ECF No. 45.) That order denied Plaintiff's motion with a substantial  
4 explanation of the reasons why, including that the record of this and the related cases shows that  
5 Plaintiff has had access to legal reference materials, and writing and mailing materials, despite  
6 his contentions.

7 Further, the Court is prohibited from giving Plaintiff legal advice, including details on  
8 how to conduct discovery. Pliler v. Ford, 542 U.S. 225, 231 (2004). Plaintiff is instead referred  
9 to the Court's First Informational Order (ECF No. 4) and Discovery and Scheduling Order (ECF  
10 No. 30) issued in this case and setting forth, in plain language intended for non-attorneys,  
11 applicable rules, requirements, and deadlines for discovery in this case. Plaintiff is generally  
12 referred to the Court's January 12, 2017 order in the Levine matter more fully discussing the  
13 Court's analysis and findings of his contentions and reasons for the denial of his second motion,  
14 which are equally applicable to this third motion.

15 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY DENIES Plaintiff's third motion for an explanation of  
16 legal terminology and proceedings, filed January 11, 2017 (ECF No. 38.).

17  
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: January 13, 2017

20 /s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe  
21 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28