

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**JEFFREY E. WALKER,**  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
**v.**  
  
**MOHADJER, Clinical Psychologist, et al.,**  
  
Defendants.

Case No. 2:13-cv-1193 WBS AC P

**ORDER**

The Court has considered the request by defendants White, Strayhorn, Sheldon-Russell, Cain-Mathis, Demps, Fiallos, and Mohadjer for an extension of time to oppose Plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunctive relief (ECF No. 51) and allegations of retaliation (ECF No. 59) until after Plaintiff has had an opportunity to oppose defendants’ motion to revoke plaintiff’s *in forma pauperis* (IFP) status. The court finds good cause to grant the request.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Defendants shall not be required to provide an opposition until after the court issues a ruling on their pending motion to revoke IFP, if a further response is deemed necessary;
2. Defendants’ counsel must file notice as soon as counsel is informed that plaintiff’s legal materials have been restored to him and he has access to the law library;
3. Upon the filing and service of such notice, plaintiff will have thirty days to file his

1 opposition to defendants' motion to revoke plaintiff's in forma pauperis status. Plaintiff may, but  
2 is not required to, file his opposition sooner if he can do so under present circumstances; and

3 4. Plaintiff's failure to oppose the motion within the time provided will be deemed a  
4 statement of non-opposition to the motion and result in a recommendation that the motion be  
5 granted.

6 DATED: February 26, 2014

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