

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

7 AARON McCOY,

No. C 09-4768 SI (pr)

8 Plaintiff,

**ORDER**

9 v.

10 MIKE EVANS, warden; et al.,


11 Defendants.  
12 \_\_\_\_\_/

13 Plaintiff filed a "request for case clarification/disposition" in which he asked the court to  
14 inform him of the final disposition of *Furnace v. Evans*, 2009 WL 2511969. (Docket # 51.) The  
15 request is GRANTED and the information will be provided this time; however, no further such  
16 requests will be entertained because the court does not do factual or legal research for litigants  
17 and does not have sufficient time to serve as fact-checker for the prison rumor mill. The docket  
18 sheet for *Furnace v. Evans*, No. C 06-4229 MMC, shows that an appeal is pending from the  
19 order granting summary judgment in favor of defendants. That means that plaintiff was  
20 extremely misinformed when told that a prisoner had a multi-million dollar victory in that case.

21 The court also notes that plaintiff misrepresented what the court had earlier determined  
22 about his case. Plaintiff stated that the "court has even ruled that most of his claims had merit  
23 and should not be dismissed." (Docket # 51, p. 2.) The order to which he referred actually said  
24 something quite different: "The denial of the motion to dismiss says nothing about the merits of  
25 plaintiff's claims and only concerns the sufficiency of the pleading." (Docket # 45, p. 20.)  
26 Plaintiff is cautioned to read the court's orders more carefully.

27 IT IS SO ORDERED.

28 Dated: December 16, 2011

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SUSAN ILLSTON  
United States District Judge