

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**

WILLIAM J. GRADFORD,

Plaintiff,

v.

MCDUGALL, et al.,

Defendants.

1:17-cv-00201-DAD-GSA-PC

**ORDER RE PLAINTIFF’S NOTICE  
(ECF No. 8.)**

**ORDER FOR CLERK TO SEND DOCKET  
SHEET TO PLAINTIFF**

William J. Gradford (“Plaintiff”) is a prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed this case on February 13, 2017. (ECF No. 1.)

Plaintiff is currently incarcerated at the Stanislaus County Public Safety Center in Modesto, California (“SCPSC”). On May 22, 2017, Plaintiff filed a notice with the court, addressing the following.

**I. PLAINTIFF’S MAIL**

Plaintiff notified the court that mail was stolen at SCPSC in May 2017. Plaintiff requests the court to re-serve any documents mailed to him by the court during that time. According to the court’s record, the court did not send Plaintiff any documents in May 2017. Therefore, Plaintiff’s request for re-service of documents is moot. The Clerk shall be directed to send Plaintiff a docket sheet for this case, for his records.

1 **II. EXHAUSTION OF REMEDIES**

2 Plaintiff asserts that he attempted to exhaust his remedies at SCPFC but was told by the  
3 Facility Commander not to file a grievance. Thus, Plaintiff has provided evidence that he  
4 attempted to exhaust his administrative remedies at the Jail but was prevented from doing so.  
5 Exhaustion of remedies for this case is not presently at issue in this case, and therefore this  
6 evidence shall be disregarded. Plaintiff should re-submit his evidence of exhaustion at a later  
7 stage of the proceedings if exhaustion of remedies becomes an issue, such as if Defendants file  
8 a motion for summary judgment based on failure to exhaust.

9 **III. FILING FEE PAYMENTS**

10 Plaintiff reports that SCPSF has not been deducting funds from his account for payment  
11 of the filing fee for this case, as ordered by the court.

12 The court's order directing officials at SCPSF to send payments to the court for  
13 Plaintiff's filing fee was issued on March 17, 2017. (ECF No. 10.) It is early in the process to  
14 determine whether the required payments are not being made. The court's order requires  
15 payments only once a month, and only if Plaintiff's account contains more than \$10.00. If  
16 Plaintiff has further concerns, he should inquire at SCPSF whether the required payments are  
17 being made.

18 **IV. CONCLUSION**

19 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 20 1. This order resolves the issues raised in Plaintiff's notice filed on May 22, 2017;  
21 and  
22 2. The Clerk of Court is directed to send Plaintiff a copy of the docket sheet for  
23 this case.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Dated: June 8, 2017

26 /s/ Gary S. Austin  
27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
28