

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

JERRY CLOUD,

Plaintiff,

v.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF
CORRECTIONS, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-00339-GGH
ORDER

Plaintiff brings this prisoner civil rights case pro se and in forma pauperis. On June 13, 2018, defendant Daniel S. Wong filed a Motion for Summary Judgment that, if successful, would resolve the case as to the allegations against him. ECF No. 38. Plaintiff must file either an Opposition or a Statement of Non-Opposition to defendant Wong’s Motion pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rule No. 230(c). Because of plaintiff’s situation the court will, however, give him additional time to complete the exercise, rather than the time prescribed by the Rule, should he need it.¹ Plaintiff is cautioned that failure to adhere to the requirement of this

///

¹ Rule 230(c) measures the time for opposition or non-opposition from the at set for hearing by the moving party. Thus, in normal circumstances a responding party may have as little as 14 days from the service of the motion to file a response.

1 Rule will result in a recommendation by this court that the matter be dismissed by the district
2 court.

3 1. Plaintiff shall 30 days from the date of this Order to file either an Opposition or a
4 Statement of Non-Opposition to the Motion for Summary Judgment filed by defendant Daniel S.
5 Wong;

6 2. Defendant Wong shall have 14 days from the date of service of the pleading filed
7 by plaintiff to file his Reply Memorandum if he chooses to file one;

8 3. The Clerk of the Court shall randomly assign a district court judge to this action.

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10 Dated: June 15, 2018

11 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows
12 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28