1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	WILLIAM TOWNSEND, JR.,	No. 2:09-cv-2342 CKD P
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	D.K. SISTO, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	Plaintiff has filed a document in which he makes several requests. First, he asks that the	
18	court direct the Clerk of the Court to issue ten subpoenas and send them to plaintiff. This request	
19	will be denied. If plaintiff wishes to obtain issued subpoenas, he must specify in his request who	
20	the subpoenas are for and what documents he seeks.	
21	Second, plaintiff asks that the court direct the Clerk of the Court to provide plaintiff with a	
22	status report as to "the Pending Motion before this court." However, there are no pending	
23	motions.	
24	Third, plaintiff asks that the court order defendants Cherry, Junker and Singh to file their	
25	answer. However, their answer was filed last October. ECF No. 47.	
26	Finally, plaintiff seeks reconsideration of the February 27, 2014 denial of the "motion to	
27	compel" he filed January 24, 2014. Plaintiff fails to point to any reason why the court should	
28	/////	

reconsider the February 27, 2014 order or address any of the reasons identified by the court as to why his motion to compel was denied. His request for reconsideration will therefore be denied. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY OREDERED that: 1. Plaintiff's request that the court direct the Clerk of the Court to issue ten subpoenas and send them to plaintiff (ECF No. 59) is denied. 2. Plaintiff's request that the court direct the Clerk of the Court to provide plaintiff with a status report as to "the Pending Motion before this court" is denied. 3. Plaintiff's request that the court order defendants Cherry, Junker and Singh to file their answer is denied. 4. Plaintiff's request that the court reconsider the February 27, 2014 denial of his January 24, 2014 "motion to compel" is denied. Dated: March 20, 2014 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE town2342.abs(2)