

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7

8 AARON McCOY,

No. C 09-4768 SI (pr)

9 Plaintiff,

ORDER

10 v.

11 MIKE EVANS, warden; et al.,

12 Defendants.
13 _____/

14 Defendants filed an *ex parte* request for a 15-day extension of time to file a reply in
15 support of their motion for summary judgment. Upon due consideration of the request and the
16 accompanying declaration of attorney Erin Sullivan, the court GRANTS the request. (Docket
17 # 39.) Defendants must file and serve their reply no later than **August 12, 2011**. *No further*
18 *extensions of this deadline should be expected.*

19 Plaintiff filed a motion for an order compelling prison officials not to transfer him during
20 the pendency of this action because he finds his current place of incarceration a relatively
21 supportive environment from which to litigate. The motion is DENIED. (Docket # 38.) To
22 grant the requested relief, the court would have to interfere with the ordinary day-to-day
23 operations of the prison, which generally federal courts are discouraged from doing. See Turner
24 v. Safley, 482 U.S. 78, 84-85 (1987) (judiciary should exercise restraint on matters of prison
25 administration).
26
27
28

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

Plaintiff's motion to file a lengthy opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment is DISMISSED as unnecessary. (Docket # 37.) A week before he filed his motion, the court had already permitted plaintiff's 69-page opposition brief.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 21, 2011



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge