

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JESSE KING,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:10-cv-2797 JAM DAD P

vs.

MIKE McDONALD, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On July 11, 2013, the assigned District Judge issued an order adopting in full findings and recommendations issued by the undersigned on May 1, 2013, granting defendants' motion for summary judgment and denying plaintiff's motions to amend, for summary judgment, and for injunctive relief. (ECF No. 93.) Judgment was entered on the same day. (ECF No. 94.) On July 30, 2013, plaintiff filed a document styled "Opposition to Order of Judgment." (ECF No. 96.) On August 5, 2013, defendants filed an opposition to plaintiff's filing. (ECF No. 101.) On the same day, plaintiff filed a notice of appeal. (ECF No. 102.)

After review of the document filed with the court by plaintiff on July 30, 2013 (ECF No. 96), the court finds the contents thereof too vague and conclusory to require or support further consideration of that filing by the court. Accordingly, the document will be disregarded.

1 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the document filed
2 by plaintiff on July 30, 2013 (ECF No. 96) is disregarded.

3 DATED: September 3, 2013.

4
5 
6 _____
7 DALE A. DROZD
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8 DAD:12
9 king2797.o2

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26