

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

LUIS MANUEL GARCES,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
J. PICKETT, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-0319 JAM AC P

ORDER

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, has requested an extension of time to respond to defendants’ motion for judgment on the pleadings and a stay of all motions and discovery. ECF Nos. 74, 75. Plaintiff asserts that even though the settlement conference previously scheduled in this case for May 20, 2019, was vacated on April 8, 2019, he was still transported to the courthouse, separating him from his legal property and interfering with his access to the law library. Id.

It is clear that plaintiff should not have been transported to the court, as the settlement conference was cancelled well in advance, and appropriate notifications were sent to the prison. Good cause appearing, plaintiff’s request for an extension of time to respond to the motion for judgment on the pleadings will be granted. However, his request to stay discovery and any other deadlines in the scheduling order will be denied as moot because the court has already stayed any outstanding discovery pending resolution of defendants’ motion for judgment and the deadlines in


1 the scheduling order have been vacated. ECF No. 68.

2 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

3 1. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time to respond to defendants' motion for  
4 judgment on the pleadings (ECF No. 74) is granted. Plaintiff shall have thirty days from the  
5 service of this order to respond to defendants' motion.

6 2. Plaintiff's motion for stay (ECF No. 75) is denied as moot.

7 DATED: May 28, 2019

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