

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

JOSE JUAREZ,
Plaintiff,
v.
CARMEN BUTTS, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-1996 JAM DB P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 17, 2017, the magistrate judge dismissed plaintiff’s first amended complaint for failure to state a cognizable claim under § 1983. Plaintiff was given thirty days to file a second amended complaint. On March 16, 2017, he did so. Also on February 17, the magistrate judge recommended denial of plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction requiring defendants to provide plaintiff with pain medication. The findings and recommendations advised plaintiff that he must file any objections within fourteen days. Plaintiff did not file objections or seek an extension of time within the time specified. On March 30, 2017, this court adopted the findings and recommendations.

In a document filed here on April 17, 2017, plaintiff moves for “reconsideration” of the magistrate judge’s denial of plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction. (ECF No. 29.) The court construes this motion as objections to the findings and recommendations. Since then,

1 plaintiff has also filed a motion for an extension of time to file objections to the findings and
2 recommendations (ECF No. 30), and objections (ECF No. 31). Plaintiff's objections are
3 untimely and will be denied. Plaintiff's contentions that he was unable to file timely objections
4 due to the lack of library access does not ring true because plaintiff was able to file a timely
5 second amended complaint on March 16. The court also notes that in these filings, plaintiff
6 complains not just about the lack of pain medication, which was the subject of his request for
7 injunctive relief, but also about library access, access to his property, and retaliation. Plaintiff is
8 advised that if he has pending court deadlines in this case, which he currently does not have, and
9 is unable to get access to the library or his legal materials due to his custodial status, he may seek
10 help from the court.

11 For the reasons set forth above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:

- 12 1. Plaintiff's April 17, 2017 motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 29) is denied;
- 13 2. Plaintiff's April 27, 2017 motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 30) is denied; and
- 14 3. Plaintiff's June 2, 2017 objections (ECF No. 31) will be disregarded.

15 DATED: June 28, 2017

16 /s/ John A. Mendez

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28