UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA BRUCE BENTON, No. 2:15-cv-0772 Plaintiff. **ORDER** v. EL DORADO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, et al., Defendants.

Plaintiff is an El Dorado County Jail detainee proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with this civil rights action. By order filed July 9, 2019, this court directed the United States Marshal to serve process on sole defendant Clingman based on the information provided by El Dorado County. ECF No. 60. For this reason, plaintiff's motions for extended time to obtain and submit the service information for defendant must be denied as moot. See ECF Nos. 47, 52.

Plaintiff has also filed numerous requests and motions for this court's assistance in helping him obtain additional access to the Jail's law library and supporting materials, and to begin the discovery process. See ECF Nos. 46, 49, 53, 55, 59, 63, 64, 65, 66. However, plaintiff does not currently face any deadline, and the court cannot set a deadline merely for the purpose of providing plaintiff additional library time, assistance, and/or materials. The court will grant plaintiff's request for documentation of his IFP status, ECF No. 63, and will direct the Clerk to

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	

send plaintiff a copy of the court order granting IFP status (ECF No. 26). Plaintiff's other pending motions and requests, however, must be denied. Those filings are premature for the reasons previously set forth in the undersigned's order filed May 23, 2019. See ECF No. 45. Because that order was served on plaintiff's General Delivery address, he may not have received it; therefore, the Clerk of Court will be directed to send plaintiff a copy of the order.

Plaintiff's excessive and premature filings unnecessarily consume the court's resources and may ultimately detract from the time the court can expend on the merits of his case. Plaintiff is directed to refrain from filing further matters in this action unless so directed by the court or authorized by court order. See Local Rule 110 ("Failure . . . of a party to comply with these [Local] Rules or with any order of the Court may be grounds for imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the inherent power of the Court.").

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Plaintiff's motions for extended time to obtain service information for defendant Clingman, ECF Nos. 47, 52, are denied as moot.
- 2. Plaintiff's request for verification of IFP status, ECF No. 63, is granted.
- 2. Plaintiff's other motions for the court's assistance, ECF Nos. 46, 49, 53, 55, 59, 64, 65 and 66, are denied without prejudice.
- 3. The Clerk of Court is directed to send plaintiff, together with a copy of this order, copies of the undersigned's orders filed on September 18, 2018 (ECF No. 26) and May 23, 2019 (ECF No. 45).

DATED: July 16, 2019

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

28