

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

GEORGE MARTIN, H-90626,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff(s),	)	No. C 12-3193 CRB (PR)
	)	
v.	)	ORDER
	)	
RANDY GROUNDS, Warden, et al.,	)	(Docket #69, 70 & 71)
	)	
Defendant(s).	)	

---

Good cause shown, plaintiff’s motion for an extension of time to file an opposition to defendants’ motion to dismiss, and a reply to defendants’ opposition to plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunctive relief (see docket #69), is GRANTED. Plaintiff shall file an opposition to defendants’ motion to dismiss, and a reply to defendants’ opposition to plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunctive relief, by no later than April 30, 2014, and defendants shall file a reply to plaintiff’s opposition within 14 days thereafter.

Plaintiff’s “motion to compel performance of the provisions of the California Intractable Pain Treatment Act,” and other state laws (see docket #71), and accompanying motion for contempt/sanctions for failure to abide by these state laws (see docket #70), are DENIED. Cf. Demos v. U.S. District Court, 925 F.2d 1160, 1161-62 (9th Cir. 1991) (federal district courts are without power to issue direct state courts, state judicial officers or other state officials in the performance of their duties under state law). To whatever extent plaintiff’s

1 motion may be construed as also seeking preliminary injunctive relief for the  
2 deprivation of plaintiff's federal rights, said request is already pending in  
3 plaintiff's previously-filed motion for preliminary injunctive relief (see docket  
4 #51).

5 SO ORDERED.

6 DATED: March 24, 2014

7   
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 CHARLES R. BREYER  
10 United States District Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25