| 1 | |
|----|--|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 9 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 10 | RODNEY LANCE HARMON, |
| 11 | Plaintiff, No. 2: 10-cv-3147 KJN P |
| 12 | VS. |
| 13 | DR. FOX, et al., |
| 14 | Defendants. <u>ORDER</u> |
| 15 | / |
| 16 | Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel with this civil rights action |
| 17 | seeking relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. |
| 18 | On January 19, 2011, plaintiff filed a motion for leave to amend his complaint. |
| 19 | Plaintiff's motion was not, however, accompanied by a proposed amended complaint. As a |
| 20 | litigant proceeding in forma pauperis, plaintiff's pleadings are subject to evaluation by this court |
| 21 | pursuant to the in forma pauperis statute. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Because plaintiff did not |
| 22 | submit a proposed amended complaint, the court is unable to evaluate it. Plaintiff's motion for |
| 23 | leave to amend must therefore be denied. |
| 24 | On January 27, 2011, plaintiff filed a motion for law library access. Plaintiff |
| 25 | alleges that in order to obtain law library access, he must have a court order. Plaintiff does not |
| 26 | allege why he requires law library access. For this reason, the undersigned finds that plaintiff's |
| | 1 |

| 1 | motion for law library access is not well supported. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: |
| 3 | 1. Plaintiff's motion to amend (Dkt. No. 19) is denied; |
| 4 | 2. Plaintiff's motion for law library access (Dkt. No. 20) is denied. |
| 5 | DATED: February 3, 2011 |
| 6 | |
| 7 | Ferdall & Newman |
| 8 | KENDALL J. NEWMAN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE |
| 9 | har3147.amd |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| | 2 |
| | I |