

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

CLARENCE A. GIPBSIN,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:12-cv-0556 DAD P

vs.

SCOTT KERNAN, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with an action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On August 27, 2013, the court screened plaintiff's amended complaint and addressed a number of his pending motions, including his motion for a temporary restraining order ("TRO"). However, in the court's order clause, the court inadvertently omitted reference to its ruling on plaintiff's motion for a TRO. Therefore, to clarify, for the reasons stated in the court's August 27, 2013 order, plaintiff's motion for a TRO will be denied as moot.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for a TRO (Doc. No. 39) is denied as moot.

DATED: September 5, 2013.



DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DAD:9
gipb0556.tro