

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TREANDOUS COTTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

MATTTHEW CATE, CDCR Director;
 HEDGEPEETH, Warden; G.A.
 NEOTTI, Chief Deputy Warden; SUE
 SUMMERSET, Departmental Food
 Administrator; A. LANDOU,
 Chaplain; J. BRUNSCHER,
 Supervising Correctional Cook; R.
 CONWAY, Correctional Food
 Manager; K. ROBINSON, Assitant
 Correctional Food Manager; R.
 MANUEL,

Defendants.

No. C 09-0385 WHA (PR)

**ORDER GRANTING EXTENSION
 OF TIME; DENYING MOTIONS
 FOR TELEPHONE CALLS AND
 FOR JUDICIAL DETERMINATION**

(Docket Nos. 24, 25, 26)

Plaintiff, a California prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. 1983. The first amended complaint was found to contain cognizable claims under 28 U.S.C. 1915A(a) when liberally construed, and it was served upon defendants. Defendants motion to dismiss was thereafter granted in part and denied in part.


Plaintiff has filed a motion for a court order to allow him to make telephone calls to “all the necessary spiritual guides of Shetaut Neter” in order to “set up a business opportunity for an organic vegan vendor company.” Such phone calls are not necessary to advance his present case, and plaintiff has not provided any authority that he has any general right to such an order.

1 Consequently, the motion (docket number 24) is **DENIED**. Plaintiff has also filed a motion for a
2 “judicial determination” that defendants’ attorney, D. Robert Duncan, is committing a “fraud
3 upon the court.” The basis for this motion is that plaintiff demanded from Mr. Duncan his
4 “identification and credentials” to appear before the court, and Mr. Duncan has evidently failed
5 to respond. Mr. Duncan’s state bar number appears on the front page of all of defendants’
6 filings, which should suffice. Plaintiff’s motion (docket number 25) is **DENIED**.

7 Good cause appearing, defendants’ motion for an extension of time, to and including
8 December 17, 2010, in which to file a motion for summary judgment (docket number 26) is
9 **GRANTED**. Plaintiff’s opposition to the motion, if any, shall be filed with the court and served
10 upon defendants no later than thirty days from the date the motion is filed. Defendants **shall**
11 file a reply brief no later than fifteen days after the date the opposition is filed.

12 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

13
14 Dated: October 27, 2010

15 
16 _____
17 WILLIAM ALSUP
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

19
20 G:\PRO-SE\WHA\CR.09\COTTON.MOT.wpd
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28