

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

SHERMAN D. MANNING,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
M. BUNNELL, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:12-cv-2440 MCE AC P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se who seeks relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court filed two orders on June 26, 2014. The order at ECF No. 116 addressed several of plaintiff’s requests. The order at ECF No. 117 provided plaintiff with notice as to how this matter would proceed in light of plaintiff’s recent shift to pro se status, and the rules governing this action.

Plaintiff has continued to flood the case docket with meritless and deficiently supported requests. See ECF Nos. 118 through 125. Many of these largely duplicative requests were made before plaintiff could have received the orders referenced above. Two are file-stamped as having been received on June 26, 2014, the date of the court’s orders, the other six as shortly thereafter. Due to the burdens placed on the Clerk’s staff, none have been docketed until one or several days following their receipt.

1           Calling his filing at ECF No. 118, an “emergency motion,” plaintiff asks the court to order  
2 defendants to provide him a copy of depositions, evidently at their own expense.<sup>1</sup> He makes this  
3 request purportedly as an “indigent” litigant. In the first place, plaintiff is not proceeding in  
4 forma pauperis in this action. See docket text entries showing payment and ECF No. 9 (noting  
5 filing fee paid at outset of complaint). Second, defendants are under no obligation to provide  
6 plaintiff with a copy of his deposition at their cost, and plaintiff cites no authority for such a  
7 proposition. This meritless request will be denied.

8           Plaintiff’s deficiently crafted filing at ECF No. 123 purports to be yet another motion for  
9 reconsideration of the order of the undersigned, ECF No. 100, granting plaintiff’s (former)  
10 counsel’s motion to withdraw and denying plaintiff appointment of new counsel. See ECF No.  
11 100. Two prior motions filed by plaintiff seeking reconsideration of this order are pending before  
12 the district judge. The present motion will be vacated as entirely duplicative.

13           Plaintiff’s notices and requests at ECF Nos. 119-122 and 124-125 are piecemeal,  
14 unsupported, duplicative, and largely histrionic. This court is far too enumbered to be able to  
15 individually address such persistent frivolous filings. Plaintiff may not continue to inundate the  
16 court with insubstantial filings. Should he do so, they will be disregarded.

17           Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

18           1. Plaintiff’s motion for the court to order defendants to provide him with deposition  
19 transcripts at their own cost (ECF No. 118) is denied;

20           2. Plaintiff’s third motion for reconsideration of this court’s order at ECF No. 100 is  
21 vacated as wholly duplicative;

22           3. Plaintiff’s piecemeal, duplicative and insubstantial notices and requests at ECF Nos.

23 ///

24 ///


25 ///

---

26 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff in this filing resumes his allegations against non-party C/O McCartney, asking again  
27 that this guard not be allowed to handle his mail. Plaintiff’s dramatically framed claims against  
28 McCartney have been previously addressed and, until adequately supported, will not be revisited.  
See ECF No. 116.

1 119-122, 124-125 are hereby disregarded; plaintiff is cautioned that future frivolous filings will  
2 be similarly disregarded.

3 DATED: July 8, 2014

4   
5 ALLISON CLAIRE  
6 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28