

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

ROBERT TUNSTALL,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:08-cv-3176-WBS-JFM (PC)

vs.

MIKE KNOWLES, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action is proceeding on plaintiff’s original complaint, filed December 31, 2008. Therein, plaintiff claims defendants Mike Knowles, V. Kahle, J. P. Gonzalez, all officials at California Medical Facility (CMF), and N. Grannis, Chief of the Inmate Appeals Branch with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, have violated his federal constitutional and statutory rights by denying him access to sign language classes.

On April 28, 2011 and April 29, 2011, plaintiff filed requests styled as motions for injunctive relief. By these requests, plaintiff seeks leave of court to file an opposition to defendants’ April 5, 2011 motion to modify the scheduling order. Plaintiff apparently failed to properly address the envelope by which he intended to mail the opposition to the court. Defendants’ motion was granted by order filed May 3, 2011. Review of plaintiff’s opposition,

1 which is appended as an exhibit to plaintiff's motions, reveals no grounds that would warrant  
2 reconsideration of that order. The court's May 3, 2011 order will be confirmed.

3 On June 2, 2011, plaintiff filed a motion styled as a motion for a ninety-day  
4 extension of time. By that motion, plaintiff apparently sought a stay of this action pending  
5 completion of his transfer to California State Prison-Sacramento (CSP-Sacramento). Plaintiff  
6 filed a notice of change of address on June 22, 2011. Plaintiff's June 2, 2011 motion is moot and  
7 will therefore be denied.

8 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 9 1. Plaintiff's April 28, 2011 and April 29, 2011 requests are granted in part;  
10 2. After review of plaintiff's opposition to defendants' April 5, 2011 motion, this  
11 court's May 3, 2011 order granted defendants' motion is confirmed; and  
12 3. Plaintiff's June 2, 2011 motion for a ninety-day extension of time is denied.

13 DATED: September 14, 2011.

14  
15   
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17  
18 <sup>12</sup>  
tuns3176.mos