

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

PATRICK BUMPUS,
Plaintiff,
v.
A. NANGALAMA, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:12-cv-1102 GEB DAD P

ORDER

Plaintiff Patrick Bumpus is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action filed pursuant to § 1983. In his complaint, plaintiff contends that, while he was incarcerated at California State Prison-Sacramento, defendants Nangalama, Dillan, Sahota, Cox, Teachow, and Deem were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs, in violation of the Eighth Amendment’s prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment.

On February 23, 2015, plaintiff filed a motion to stay the proceedings herein. Plaintiff’s moving papers provide that he was admitted to the Mule Creek State Prison mental health crisis ward on January 22, 2015, and that he anticipated imminent transfer to a facility operated by the California Department of State Hospitals. Plaintiff therefore requested that this case be stayed either for a period of six months or until his hospital discharge. (ECF No. 46 at 1-2.)

Defendants filed a statement of non-opposition to plaintiff’s motion. (ECF No. 47.)


////

1 On March 23, 2015, plaintiff filed a notice a change of address with the court indicating
2 that he had been transferred to California Medical Facility in Vacaville, California. (ECF
3 No. 48.) On August 6, 2015, plaintiff filed a notice of change of address with the court indicating
4 that he had been transferred to High Desert State Prison in Susanville, California. (ECF No. 49.)
5 The latter notice provides: "I would like to resume my case where I left off. Please let me know
6 what my next step is, or will be." (Id. at 1.)

7 Because it appears that plaintiff has now been discharged from a hospital setting to state
8 prison, the court will deny plaintiff's motion for stay as moot. An order which addresses
9 defendants' motion to compel discovery responses (ECF No. 42) and plaintiff's motion for
10 appointment of counsel will be forthcoming.

11 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's February 23, 2015 motion for a
12 stay of the proceedings (ECF No. 46) is denied as moot.

13 Dated: August 14, 2015

14 

15 _____
16 DALE A. DROZD
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

18 DAD:10
19 bump1102.stay.deny
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28