1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 ANDRE CRAVER, No. 2: 11-cv-1344 TLN KJN P 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. **ORDER** 14 J. HASTY, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff is a state prisoner, proceeding without counsel, with a civil rights action pursuant 18 to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action is set for jury trial before the Honorable Troy L. Nunley on 19 September 28, 2015. Pending before the court is plaintiff's November 4, 2014 motion for 20 monetary sanctions. (ECF No. 126.) For the following reasons, this motion is denied. 21 Plaintiff moves for sanctions against defendants based on their failure to oppose his 22 motion to allow the declaration of Nurse Pearsal. (ECF No. 104.) The background to the motion for sanctions is set forth herein. 23 24 On June 4, 2014, plaintiff filed a motion to allow the declaration of Nurse Pearsal. (Id.) On June 9, 2014, plaintiff filed two motions: motion for witnesses to appear telephonically (ECF 25 26 No. 105) and motion for summary trial proceedings (ECF No. 106). On June 9, 2014, plaintiff 27 filed a motion requesting the testimony of Nurse Reynolds. (ECF No. 107). On September 8, 28 2014, plaintiff filed a motion for sanctions. (ECF No. 120).

On October 16, 2014, the undersigned issued an order denying the five motions set forth above. (ECF No. 122.) In this order, the undersigned noted that plaintiff's motion to allow the declaration of Nurse Pearsal (ECF No. 104), motion for defendants to provide written testimony of Nurse Reynolds (ECF No. 107), and motion for sanctions (ECF No. 120), were related. (ECF No. 122 at 1.) The undersigned addressed these three motions together, noting that defendants had failed to oppose plaintiff's motion to allow the declaration of Nurse Pearsal. (Id. at 2.) Plaintiff now moves for sanctions based on defendants' failure to oppose this motion.

Defendants' failure to oppose plaintiff's motion to allow the declaration of Nurse Pearsal is not sanctionable conduct. Plaintiff has not demonstrated that he was prejudiced by defendants' failure to oppose this motion. Moreover, after reviewing the record, the undersigned determined that an opposition to this motion was not required, as defendants had opposed the other related motions.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for sanctions (ECF No. 126) is denied.

Dated: November 24, 2014

Cr1344.san

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE