1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 WARREN C. GREEN, No. 2:14-cy-02854-TLN-AC 11 Plaintiff, 12 v. ORDER FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF 13 APPOINTED COUNSEL CDCR, et al., 14 Defendants. 15 16 This matter is before the Court on a request by Plaintiff's former appointed counsel for 17 reimbursement of former counsel's late submitted expenses. 18 Plaintiff is a state prisoner who filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C § 1983, 19 pro se and in forma pauperis. On March 31, 2017, the Court found the appointment of counsel 20 for Plaintiff was warranted and referred the case to the Court's Pro Bono Program Director to 21 attempt to locate pro bono counsel to represent Plaintiff. (ECF No. 23.) Chijioke O. Ikonte 22 ("Ikonte"), from the Court's pro bono attorney panel, volunteered to represent Plaintiff for the 23 limited purpose of drafting and filing a third amended complaint. The Court appointed Ikonte 24 and ordered that the appointment would terminate when Plaintiff's amended complaint was filed. 25 (ECF No. 24.) Plaintiff filed his third amended complaint, (ECF No. 26), and the next month the 26 magistrate judge issued an order terminating the appointment, (ECF No. 27). Ikonte submitted 27 previously approved expenses for reimbursement after the 30-day deadline. 28 1

General Order No. 558 governs the reimbursement of appointed pro bono counsel. Gen. Order No. 558. Pursuant to section 1, subsection C, pro bono counsel seeking reimbursement under the order must file a request for reimbursement within thirty days of the order terminating their representation. Gen. Order 558(C). Subsection C allows the Court to reimburse expenses filed after the thirty day deadline if good cause exists. Gen. Order 558(C).

Ikonte took on a limited purpose appointment, with an order terminating his appointment on filing of the amended complaint. At a different, later date, an order was entered terminating his appointment. The two potential dates from which to calculate termination of Ikonte's representation of the defendant could create confusion regarding the appropriate date from which to start calculating the thirty days. Accordingly, the Court finds good causes exists and hereby Orders reimbursement of Ikonte's judicially-approved expenses which comply with the other limits of the policy, such as section 2, subsection D, regarding documentation requirements. The Clerk of the Court is directed to serve a copy of this order upon Chijioke O. Ikonte, Akudinobi & Ikonte, 3435 Wilshire Blvd, suite 1520, Los Angeles, CA 90010.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 12, 2017

Troy L. Nunley

United States District Judge