(PC) Baker v	v. Perez et al	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	MICHAEL BAKER,	
11	Plaintiff,	No. 2: 09-cv-2757 MCE KJN P
12	vs.	
13	PEREZ, et al.,	
14	Defendants.	ORDER
15		
16	Plaintiff is a state prisoner, proceeding without counsel, with a civil rights action	
17	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On March 28, 2012, the undersigned recommended that	
18	defendants' summary judgment motion be granted in part and denied in part. On April 18, 2012,	
19	defendants filed a motion for leave to file a supplemental summary judgment motion. On May	
20	29, 2012, the undersigned denied that request.	
21	On July 20, 2012, the undersigned vacated the March 28, 2012 findings and	
22	recommendations and gave plaintiff notice of the requirements for opposing summary judgment	
23	motions pursuant to Woods v. Carey, 684 F.3d 934 (9th Cir. 2012). This order granted plaintiff	
24	twenty-one days to file either a new opposition, a supplemental opposition, or a statement that he	
25	relied on his previously filed opposition.	
26	////	
		1

Doc. 118

On August 13, 2012, plaintiff filed a supplemental opposition addressing the claims as to which the undersigned previously recommended that summary judgment for defendants be granted. After carefully reviewing plaintiff's supplemental opposition, the undersigned finds that plaintiff's exhibits and briefing have muddied the waters as to some claims. For this reason, the undersigned has determined that it is in the court's best interest for defendants to file a renewed summary judgment motion addressing all claims.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Defendants' summary judgment motion (Dkt. No. 71) is vacated;
- 2. Within thirty days of the date of this order, defendants shall file a comprehensive renewed summary judgment motion; plaintiff's opposition is due twenty-one days thereafter; defendants' reply is due seven days thereafter.

DATED: October 19, 2012

13

14

15

16

bak2757.vac

18

22

23 24

26

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

²⁵

¹ For example, it appears from plaintiff's new exhibits that defendant Medina may have ordered the discontinuation of plaintiff's Tramadol on November 10, 2008, rather than on November 3, 2008, as previously found. Plaintiff has also submitted exhibits indicating that he was prescribed Tramadol when he arrived at High Desert State Prison on November 3, 2008. Plaintiff has also attached medical records from California State Prison-Corcoran demonstrating that he was prescribed Tramadol 50mg, four times per day at Corcoran prior to his transfer to High Desert State Prison.