1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	MADY CHAN,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-09-2006 MCE GGH P
12	VS.
13	COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,
14	Defendants. <u>FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATIONS</u>
15	/
15 16	/ Plaintiff is a prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with a civil rights
	/ Plaintiff is a prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 3, 2012, plaintiff filed an interlocutory appeal
16	
16 17	action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 3, 2012, plaintiff filed an interlocutory appeal
16 17 18	action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 3, 2012, plaintiff filed an interlocutory appeal concerning the denial of his motion for injunctive relief. A dispositive motion deadline had been
16 17 18 19	action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 3, 2012, plaintiff filed an interlocutory appeal concerning the denial of his motion for injunctive relief. A dispositive motion deadline had been set for January 26, 2012, and defendants have moved to vacate that date until the appeal has been
16 17 18 19 20	action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 3, 2012, plaintiff filed an interlocutory appeal concerning the denial of his motion for injunctive relief. A dispositive motion deadline had been set for January 26, 2012, and defendants have moved to vacate that date until the appeal has been resolved. Because the merits of the appeal duplicate, for the most part, the merits of the case, at
16 17 18 19 20 21	action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 3, 2012, plaintiff filed an interlocutory appeal concerning the denial of his motion for injunctive relief. A dispositive motion deadline had been set for January 26, 2012, and defendants have moved to vacate that date until the appeal has been resolved. Because the merits of the appeal duplicate, for the most part, the merits of the case, at least with respect to the dental claim, the undersigned will recommend that this action be stayed
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 3, 2012, plaintiff filed an interlocutory appeal concerning the denial of his motion for injunctive relief. A dispositive motion deadline had been set for January 26, 2012, and defendants have moved to vacate that date until the appeal has been resolved. Because the merits of the appeal duplicate, for the most part, the merits of the case, at least with respect to the dental claim, the undersigned will recommend that this action be stayed and administratively closed pending the appeal. The parties shall notify the court within 14 days
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 3, 2012, plaintiff filed an interlocutory appeal concerning the denial of his motion for injunctive relief. A dispositive motion deadline had been set for January 26, 2012, and defendants have moved to vacate that date until the appeal has been resolved. Because the merits of the appeal duplicate, for the most part, the merits of the case, at least with respect to the dental claim, the undersigned will recommend that this action be stayed and administratively closed pending the appeal. The parties shall notify the court within 14 days of the appeal being resolved.
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 3, 2012, plaintiff filed an interlocutory appeal concerning the denial of his motion for injunctive relief. A dispositive motion deadline had been set for January 26, 2012, and defendants have moved to vacate that date until the appeal has been resolved. Because the merits of the appeal duplicate, for the most part, the merits of the case, at least with respect to the dental claim, the undersigned will recommend that this action be stayed and administratively closed pending the appeal. The parties shall notify the court within 14 days of the appeal being resolved. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be stayed and

1	These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District
2	Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(l). Within fourteen
3	days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written
4	objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned
5	"Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Any reply to the objections
6	shall be served and filed within seven days after service of the objections. The parties are
7	advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the
8	District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).
9	DATED: February 8, 2012
10	/s/ Gregory G. Hollows UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
11	GGH: AB
12	chan2006.ord13
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	2

I