I

| 1 | |
|---------|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 9 10 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 10 | MANUEL GUADALUPE SANCHEZ, JR., Plaintiff, No. CIV S-10-2029 DAD (TEMP) P |
| 11 | Plaintiff, No. CIV S-10-2029 DAD (TEMP) P vs. |
| 12 | T. VIRGA, et al., |
| 13 | Defendants. ORDER |
| 15 | |
| 16 | Plaintiff has requested an extension of time to file an in forma pauperis |
| 17 | application pursuant to the court's order of September 27, 2010. Good cause appearing, his |
| 18 | request will be granted. |
| 19 | Plaintiff has also filed a motion in which he asks that the court hold this action in |
| 20 | abeyance while he exhausts "state remedies" with respect to his claims. However, plaintiff fails |
| 21 | to cite any authority in support of his request and does not point to any facts indicating that stay |
| 22 | and abeyance would be appropriate in this case. Accordingly, his request will be denied at this |
| 23 | time. |
| 24 | //// |
| 25 | //// |
| 26 | ///// |
| | |
| | |

| 1 | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: |
|----------|---|
| 2 | 1. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time (Docket No. 12) is granted; |
| 3 | 2. Plaintiff's in forma paupers application (Docket No. 13) is deemed timely |
| 4 | filed; and |
| 5 | 3. Plaintiff's motion to hold this matter in abeyance (Docket No. 5) is denied. |
| 6 | DATED: January 13, 2011. |
| 7 | |
| 8 | Dale A. Drogd DALE A. DROZD |
| 9 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE |
| 10 | |
| 11 | kc/kly sanc2029.36 |
| 12 | sanc2029.30 |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 26 | |
| 20 | |
| | |
| I | |