

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MATTHEW FORREY HOLGERSON,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-06-0248 JKS EFB P

vs.

MIKE KNOWLES, et. al.,

Defendants.

ORDER


_____/

Plaintiff, a prisoner without counsel, commenced an action in this court seeking relief for alleged civil rights violations. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 19, 2008, the district judge dismissed this action and the Clerk of the Court entered judgment. However, on August 31, 2010, plaintiff filed a letter to the court asking that the case be reopened. Plaintiff’s rambling letter states, *inter alia*, that his legal mail was doused with chemicals that caused brain damage, that the National Security Agency assaulted his mother, and that he is not he is not “partitioned or separated neurologically” into the “thought centers” that most people have.

Even if the court were to construe plaintiff’s letter as a motion for relief from a final judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60, such motions must be filed within a “reasonable time.” As plaintiff’s motion was not filed until more than two years after judgment was entered, it would necessarily be denied as untimely.

1 The court will issue no response to future filings not authorized by the civil or appellate
2 procedural rules.

3 Dated: August 26, 2010.

4 
5 EDMUND F. BRENNAN
6 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26