

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

JOSEPH ROBINSON,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-10-2948 JAM DAD PS

v.

PLUMAS COUNTY,

Defendant.

ORDER

_____ /

The pro se plaintiff has filed two motion requesting that the court rule on defendant’s pending motion to dismiss. (Doc. Nos. 31 & 32.) Therein, plaintiff argues that this court should rule on defendant’s pending motion to dismiss forthwith. Although hearing dates are referred to in the captions and the body of both motions, neither motion was properly noticed for hearing in compliance with the Local Rules. See Local Rule 230(b). Moreover, the court will issuing findings and recommendations with respect to defendant’s pending motion to dismiss in due time. Plaintiff’s motions for a ruling are unnecessary. Therefore, plaintiff’s May

/////
/////
/////
/////

1 10, 2011 (Doc. No. 31) and May 12, 2011(Doc. No. 32) motions for ruling are denied. The
2 matters will not appear on the court's June 17, 2011 calendar.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: June 16, 2011.

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

8 DAD:6
9 robinson2948.ord.den.motruling

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