

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  
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

AARON McCOY,

No. C 09-4768 SI (pr)

Plaintiff,

**ORDER**

v.

MIKE EVANS, warden; et al.,

Defendants.  

---

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

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 16 2011

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