1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 CHRISTOPHER NATHANIEL No. 2:16-cv-1341 JAM DB P WASHINGTON, 12 Plaintiff, 13 **ORDER** v. 14 YOUNG, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 18 19 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff claims defendants directed another inmate to physically assault him in 20 violation of the Eighth Amendment. Presently before the court is plaintiff's motion for an 21 extension of time to file new evidence. (ECF No. 78.) 22 Plaintiff requests the court refrain from ruling on the pending motion for terminating sanctions (ECF No. 41), for at least twenty days so that plaintiff can submit new evidence. 23 24 Plaintiff seeks leave to file newly discovered evidence showing that defense counsel violated 25 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11. 26 The pending motion for terminating sanctions relates to the allegation that plaintiff 27 violated Rule 11 by filing a declaration purportedly written by a fellow inmate. However, a Rule 28 11 violation by defense counsel is unrelated and has no bearing on the court's ruling on

defendant's pending motion for sanctions. Plaintiff is informed that a motion for sanctions pursuant to Rule 11 must be made separately from any other motion. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(c)(2). Accordingly, plaintiff does not need for an extension of time to file evidence showing defense counsel violated Rule 11 because such evidence will not impact on the court's ruling on the pending motion. For the reasons set forth above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 78) is denied. Dated: January 13, 2019 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE DLB:12 DLB:1/Orders/Prisoner/Civil.Rights/wash1341.36evd