UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAWTIS DONALD RHODEN,) Case No.: 1:18-cv-00101-LJO-SAB (PC)
Plaintiff, v. DEPARTMENT OF STATE HOSPITALS, et al., Defendants.	ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, WITHOUT PREJUDICE, TO RE-FILING WITH PROPER RAND NOTICE [ECF No. 63]

Plaintiff Lawtis Donald Rhoden is a civil detainee appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On October 7, 2019, Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment.

In <u>Woods v. Carey</u>, 684 F.3d 934, 939 (9th Cir. 2012), the Ninth Circuit held that a pro se prisoner plaintiff must be provided with "fair notice" of the requirements for opposing a motion for summary judgment at the time the motion is brought. Review of Defendant Garcia's motion shows that he did not provide Plaintiff with a <u>Rand</u> notice upon the filing of the motion for summary judgment. <u>See Rand v. Rowland</u>, 154 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 1998). In particular, Defendants failed to advise Plaintiff of the contents of the applicable Eastern District of California Local Rule requirements, *i.e.*, Local Rule 260. <u>Rand</u>, at 961. Accordingly, the Court must deny the entire motion, without prejudice, because the <u>Rand</u> notice is required to be filed simultaneously with the motion. <u>Id.</u> at 960.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Defendants' motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 63) is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE;
- 2. Defendants are granted an extension of time, shall file the motion for summary judgment within **seven (7) days** of the date of entry of this order, and shall provide Plaintiff with the appropriate <u>Rand</u> notice; and
- 3. After the time for Defendants to file a properly noticed motion for summary judgment, Plaintiff has thirty (30) days to file a response.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **October 8, 2019**

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE