

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 JESSE WASHINGTON,

11 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-04-1317 MCE GGH P

12 vs.

13 J. FANNON, et al.,

14 Defendants.

ORDER

15 _____/
16 On December 1, 2007, by minute order the court denied all pending motions in
17 limine without prejudice. The minute order stated that the parties could re-notice their motions
18 for May 18, 2009. The court identified the motions in limine as court file documents 150, 151,
19 152, 156 and 181.

20 On December 15, 2008, plaintiff filed objections to the minute order. Plaintiff
21 states that he does not know what motions in limine the minute order refers to. The court
22 construes plaintiff's objections as a request for clarification.

23 Court file document 150 is plaintiff's motion in limine "# 3" filed March 7, 2008.
24 Court file document 151 is defendants' motion in limine "# 1" filed March 14, 2008. Court file
25 document 152 is defendants' motion in limine "# 2" filed March 14, 2008. Court file document
26 156 is plaintiff's motion in limine "# 4" filed March 20, 2008. Court file document 181 is

plaintiff's motion in limine "# 5" filed May 5, 2008.

According to the minute order, *all* motions in limine were denied and must be re-noticed. Any motions in limine inadvertently not identified in the minute order must also be re-noticed according to the instructions set forth in the minute order.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's December 15, 2008, objections to the minute order (no. 208) are construed as a request for clarification.

DATED: January 12, 2009

/s/ Gregory G. Hollows

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

wash1317.cla