

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

SAMUEL ANDERSON,

Plaintiff,

No. 2: 12-cv-0261 MCE KJN P

vs.

MATTHEW TATE, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Plaintiff is a state prisoner, proceeding without counsel, with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On July 23, 2012, plaintiff filed a motion for a court order granting him permission to obtain declarations by other prisoners. Other than a declaration describing plaintiff's attempts to serve this motion, the July 23, 2012 motion is identical to a motion filed by plaintiff on July 11, 2012. On July 20, 2012, the undersigned denied plaintiff's July 11, 2012 motion for a court order granting him permission to obtain declarations by other prisoners. Accordingly, plaintiff's July 23, 2012 motion for a court order granting him permission to obtain declarations by other prisoners is denied as duplicative.

On July 23, 2012, plaintiff filed a motion for an extension of time. On July 11, 2012, plaintiff filed an identical motion which the undersigned granted on July 20, 2012. Accordingly, plaintiff's July 23, 2012 is denied as duplicative.

1           On July 27, 2012 plaintiff filed a letter with the court, docketed as a “motion,”  
2 alleging inadequate law library access. Plaintiff alleges that on July 19, 2012 he submitted a  
3 “request for interview to the D yard law library.” Plaintiff alleges that he received the form back  
4 with no reply. Plaintiff requests that the court order prison officials to grant him law library  
5 access.

6           All requests for court orders must be made by motion. Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b).  
7 Plaintiff’s July 27, 2012 request for law library access is disregarded as it is not made by motion.  
8 In addition, plaintiff has cited only one occasion where his request for law library access was  
9 allegedly not properly processed. Plaintiff also does not identify any prison officials who were  
10 involved in the alleged mishandling of his request. For these reasons, plaintiff’s request for law  
11 library access is not adequately supported.


12           Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

13           1. Plaintiff’s July 23, 2012 motion for an extension of time (Dkt. No. 71) is  
14 denied;

15           2. Plaintiff’s motion for a court order granting him permission to obtain  
16 declarations (Dkt. No. 72) is denied;

17           3. Plaintiff’s July 27, 2012 letter, docketed as a motion (Dkt. No. 73), is  
18 disregarded.

19 DATED: August 2, 2012

20  
21   
22 KENDALL J. NEWMAN  
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

24 an261.dup