| 1 | |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 9 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 10 | |
| 11 | LARRY GIRALDES, JR., NO. CIV. S-01-2110 LKK/EFB |
| 12 | Plaintiff, |
| 13 | v. <u>ORDER</u> |
| 14 | T. PREBULA, et al., |
| 15 | Defendants. |
| 16 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| 17 | On October 14, 2012, this court issued an order dismissing |
| 18 | Plaintiff's suit without prejudice, based on the Ninth Circuit's |
| 19 | holding in <u>Vaden v. Summerhill</u> , 449 F.3d 1047 (9th Cir. 2006). ¹ |
| 20 | Order, ECF No. 209. Plaintiff was given thirty days from the |
| 21 | issuance of the court's order to file a second amended complaint. |
| 22 | Id. Plaintiff has not yet filed a second amended complaint. |
| 23 | //// |
| 24 | ¹ The court determined that the holding in <u>Vaden</u> indicated |
| | I me court decermined that the nording in <u>vaden</u> indicated |

The court determined that the holding in <u>Vaden</u> indicated that Plaintiff had brought this action on November 16, 2001, when he filed his original complaint, and therefore, before the Director's Level denials on Plaintiff's grievances were issued.

The court is in receipt of counsel for Plaintiff's request for authority to incur \$8,300.00 in costs for fees for Dr. Ralph E. Koldinger. Because Plaintiff has not yet filed a second amended complaint, and Plaintiff's case has been dismissed, counsel for Plaintiff's request for pre-approval of expenditures is premature. Counsel's request is therefore DENIED, without prejudice to renew following Plaintiff's filing of a second amended complaint. The Clerks' Office is directed to file Plaintiff's request for authority to incur costs on the docket. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: November 1, 2012. KARLTO Κ. SENIOR JUDGE TED STATES DISTRICT COURT