

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DANIEL CARREON, JR.,
Plaintiff,
v.
S. BANKE, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:11-cv-2952-WBS-EFB P

ORDER


Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On May 7, 2013, defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. ECF No. 36. After two extensions of time, plaintiff filed an opposition. ECF No. 43. Thereafter, defendants filed a reply. ECF No. 44. Plaintiff now requests leave to file a “reply” to defendants’ reply, so that he can present evidence in support of his claims. *See* ECF No. 45 (stating that some of his legal property was misplaced and that he was unable to file it with his opposition). Neither the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure nor the court’s Local Rules authorize such a filing. Moreover, defendants’ motion notified plaintiff of the requirements for opposing a summary judgment motion, including the requirement that he support his claims with evidence. Plaintiff had ample time to prepare his opposition and to submit evidence in support of his claims. At the time plaintiff filed his opposition, he did not indicate that it was incomplete in any way or state that

1 any of his evidence or legal property had been misplaced. *See* ECF No. 43. Plaintiff fails to
2 demonstrate good cause for an order allowing him to supplement his opposition, as requested.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's request (ECF No. 45) is denied.

4 Dated: August 15, 2013.

5 
6 EDMUND F. BRENNAN
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28