1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Plaintiff, v.	
2	v. J. LOPEZ, JR., et al.,	OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT
13 14 15	Defendants.	(ECF No. 37) <b>FWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE</b>
16	Plaintiff Michael Jacques is proceeding pr	o se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights

action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case proceeds against Defendants Lopez, Razo, Athie,
and Garza for excessive force, against Defendant Vasquez for failing to intervene during the
alleged use of excessive force, and against Defendant G. Aro for deliberate indifference to a
serious medical need in violation of the Eighth Amendment.

On December 17, 2018, Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment under Federal 21 Rule of Civil Procedure 56 on the grounds that there are no genuine issues of material fact in 22 dispute, that Plaintiff's claims are barred by the favorable termination rule, that Defendants are 23 entitled to judgment as a matter of law, and that Defendants are entitled to qualified immunity. 24 (ECF No. 37.) Plaintiff was provided with notice of the requirements for opposing a motion for 25 summary judgment. Woods v. Carey, 684 F.3d 934 (9th Cir. 2012); Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 26 952, 957 (9th Cir. 1988); Klingele v. Eikenberry, 849 F.2d 409, 411-12 (9th Cir. 1988). (ECF 27 No. 37-2.) 28

1	Plaintiff's response was due within twenty-one (21) days of the date of service of	
2	Defendants' motion. That deadline has passed, but Plaintiff has not filed an opposition or	
3	statement of non-opposition to the motion, nor has he otherwise communicated with the Court.	
4	Pursuant to Local Rule 230(1), Plaintiff is HEREBY ORDERED to file an opposition or a	
5	statement of non-opposition to Defendants' summary judgment motion within twenty-one (21)	
6	days.	
7		
8	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
9	Dated: January 17, 2019	
10	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	