

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

ZENAWE MEHARI,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-08-1089 MCE DAD P

vs.

R.V. COX, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with an action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On July 1, 2009, the assigned district judge in this case denied defendants' motion to dismiss. On July 20, 2009, plaintiff filed a motion for a court order requiring defendants to file an answer to his complaint. Two days later, defendants filed an answer to plaintiff's complaint. Under the circumstances of this case, the court will deny plaintiff's motion moot.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's July 20, 2009 motion for a court order (Doc. No. 29) is denied as moot.

DATED: July 28, 2009.

DAD:9
meha1089.ans



DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE