

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

CHRISTOPHER S. RIDER,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-09-0637 MCE DAD P

vs.

PARENTE, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____/

Plaintiff has requested an extension of time to file a response to defendants' motion to dismiss. He has also filed a motion asking the court to serve a copy of his motion for an extension of time on defense counsel. On January 5, 2011, defendants filed a motion to revoke plaintiff's IFP status and to dismiss this case. On January 18, 2011, plaintiff filed a timely opposition to defendants' motion. The motion is now submitted for decision, and in due course the court will issue findings and recommendations in response thereto.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motions (Doc. Nos. 35 & 36) are denied as unnecessary.

DATED: April 1, 2011.

DAD:9
ride0637.36d



DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE