

1 Review of court records reflects that plaintiff filed the same “Motion for Judicial Notice”
2 in Israel v. Shmary, No. 2:21-cv-0262 TLN EFB P (E.D. Cal.) (current motion pending;
3 defendants filed opposition); Israel v. Giles, No. 2:21-cv-1027 DAD DMC P (E.D. Cal.) (current
4 motion pending; defendants filed opposition); Israel v. McClelland, No. 2:22-cv-0729 KJM EFB
5 P (E.D. Cal.) (new discovery and pretrial motions deadlines set on January 21, 2025; current
6 motion pending), Israel v. Moreno, No. 2:23-cv-2383 JGB SK (C.D. Cal.) (plaintiff’s motion for
7 judicial notice was denied as moot in light of the recent order modifying the scheduling order).¹

8 To the extent plaintiff asks the Court to take judicial notice of certain events involving
9 plaintiff’s access to legal materials, plaintiff’s motion is denied. The court may judicially notice a
10 fact not subject to reasonable dispute because it “(1) is generally known within the trial court’s
11 territorial jurisdiction; or (2) can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose
12 accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.” Fed. R. Evid. 201(b). The allegations set forth by
13 plaintiff are not within the category of documents subject to judicial notice. Therefore, plaintiff’s
14 motion is denied.

15 In the motion, plaintiff also claims she emailed defendants’ attorney, Deputy Attorney
16 General Judith Gronna, to report that plaintiff’s inability to access legal property was damaging
17 plaintiff’s ability to address outstanding discovery issues, but Gronna did not respond. (ECF No.
18 30 at 2.) Gronna is counsel for defendants in plaintiff’s case pending in the Central District,
19 Israel v. Moreno, No. 2:23-cv-2383 JGB SK.

20 There is no discovery pending in this action. Moreover, on January 31, 2025, plaintiff
21 was provided a copy of defendant Negrete’s motion to set aside clerk’s default. Given the
22 procedural nature of defendant’s motion, it does not appear that plaintiff needs access to legal
23 materials to file objections or to provide an opposition to defendant’s motion, if plaintiff has one.
24 Plaintiff has now had over thirty days to file objections or an opposition in response to the
25 January 31, 2025 order.

26 _____
27 ¹ A court may take judicial notice of court records. See, e.g., Bennett v. Medtronic, Inc., 285
28 F.3d 801, 803 n.2 (9th Cir. 2002) (“[W]e may take notice of proceedings in other courts, both
within and without the federal judicial system, if those proceedings have a direct relation to
matters at issue”) (internal quotation omitted).

1 In an abundance of caution, plaintiff is granted another ten days to file objections to the
2 January 14, 2025 findings and recommendations. No further extensions of time will be granted.
3 Failure to file timely objections will result in the findings and recommendations being routed to
4 the district court for review and adoption.

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 6 1. Plaintiff's motion for judicial notice (ECF No. 30) is denied; and
- 7 2. Plaintiff is granted ten days from the date of this order in which to file objections to the
8 findings and recommendations (ECF No. 27), and to file an opposition to defendant's motion to
9 set aside judgment (ECF No. 23), if any.

10 Dated: 03/06/25

11 
12 _____
13 CHI SOO KIM
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15 /1/isra1391.36b.cjra

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