

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BENJAMIN K. TOSCANO,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
G. D. LEWIS, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [12-cv-05893-EMC](#)  
**ORDER**  
Docket Nos. 331, 332

On January 30, 2017, the Court appointed counsel to represent Plaintiff in pretrial proceedings and at trial. Thereafter, Plaintiff filed a *pro se* motion for a copy of the memorandum sent to the Federal Pro Bono Project – his seventh such motion – and a *pro se* motion for clarification of a deadline for experts. Plaintiff’s *pro se* motions are **DENIED**. (Docket Nos. 331 and 332.) Now that Plaintiff is represented by counsel, the Court will not entertain *pro se* filings from him. When a litigant is represented by an attorney, the Court will not accept motions and requests from the litigant himself (other than a request to discharge the attorney who is representing him). *See generally United States v. Mujahid*, 799 F.3d 1228, 1236 (9th Cir. 2015) (district court acted within its discretion in declining to grant request made *pro se* by a litigant who was then represented by counsel); *McCullough v. Graber*, 726 F.3d 1057, 1059 n.1 (9th Cir. 2013) (declining to consider *pro se* letters from habeas petitioner because he was represented by

///  
///  
///  
///  
///

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

counsel); *Rosenblum v. Campbell*, 370 F. App'x 782 (9th Cir. 2010) (denying petitioner's motion for leave to file a *pro se* supplemental brief; "[b]ecause [petitioner] is represented by counsel, only counsel may submit filings.") Plaintiff may not file any more *pro se* motions as long as he is represented by counsel.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: February 21, 2017

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
EDWARD M. CHEN  
United States District Judge