

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

MIKEAL GLENN STINE,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
BUREAU OF PRISONS, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:18-cv-0684 TLN KJN P


ORDER

On August 9, 2019, plaintiff filed a “Motion for Status Conference.” (ECF No. 53.) Plaintiff reiterates his claims raised in his motion to reopen this action, and seeks a status conference “to progress the case.” (Id. at 2.) Plaintiff is advised that no status conference is warranted because all prisoner cases are addressed on the papers.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, as plaintiff was previously informed, any complaint concerning his current conditions of confinement in Terre Haute, Indiana, must be brought in an appropriate court in Indiana.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion (ECF No. 53) is denied.

Dated: August 23, 2019

stin0684.dn2

  
KENDALL J. NEWMAN  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

<sup>1</sup> Further, “[j]udges in the Eastern District of California carry the heaviest caseloads in the nation, and this Court is unable to devote inordinate time and resources to individual cases and matters.” Cortez v. City of Porterville, 5 F. Supp. 3d 1160, 1162 (E.D. Cal. 2014). Filing multiple motions or requests will not “progress” plaintiff’s case.