

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  
28IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARK THOMAS EDWARDS,

Plaintiff,

No. C 13-04788 WHA

v.

PATRICIA JONAS,

**ORDER RE JUDICIAL NOTICE**Defendant.  

---


While this order is sympathetic to plaintiff's current circumstances, plaintiff's request for judicial notice cannot be granted. *First*, plaintiff requests that "the mysterious check" allegedly sent to him on October 28, 2013, be judicially noticed. The law on judicial notice, however, only allows courts to judicially notice a fact that "is generally known within the trial court's territorial jurisdiction; or (2) can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned." FRE 201. The accuracy of the mysterious check is at best questionable given that plaintiff does not know who sent the check. Moreover, the check is not relevant to plaintiff's pending social security appeal. *Second*, plaintiff states that he left "his residence to comply with the court order" (Br. at 2). Thus, plaintiff requests "the date of the

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

court issuing [that] order” to be judicially noticed. This Court never issued such an order. Moreover, plaintiff did not specify any other court or court order that compelled him to leave his residence. Therefore, plaintiff’s request for judicial notice is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: December 5, 2013.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE