| (PC) Johnson v. Martel et al |  |
|------------------------------|--|
|                              |  |
|                              |  |
|                              |  |
|                              |  |
| 1                            |  |
| 2                            |  |
| 3                            |  |
| 4                            |  |
| 5                            |  |
| 6                            |  |
| 7                            |  |
| 8                            | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |
| 9                            | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |
| 10                           | JOSEPH JOHNSON,  |
| 11                           | Plaintiff, No. 2:09-cv-2103 JFM (PC)   |
| 12                           | VS.  |
| 13                           | G. BISHOP, et al.,   |
| 14                           | Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>   |
| 15                           | /  |
| 16                           | On April 26, 2010, plaintiff filed a motion for default. Plaintiff contends the              |
| 17                           | defendants have failed to file a responsive pleading. The docket, however, reflects that the |
| 18                           | defendants filed a timely answer on April 13, 2010.  |
| 19                           | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's April 26, 2010 motion is                  |
| 20                           | denied.  |
| 21                           | DATED: May 6, 2010.  |
| 22                           | 10 5 1110 01   |
| 23                           | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE   |
| 24                           |  |
| 25                           | /014.john2103.defj   |
| 26                           |  |
|                              |  |

Doc. 44