

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

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

MARCOS C. GUILLEN,)	No. C 06-5176 RMW (PR)
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER PROVIDING
)	PLAINTIFF NOTICE AND
v.)	WARNING; SCHEDULING
)	SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING
)	
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER ROCHA, et)	
al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

17 Plaintiff, a California prisoner pro se, filed this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. 1983.

18 Defendants have filed a motion for summary judgment. Although given an opportunity, plaintiff

19 did not file an opposition. The case is now submitted for consideration. However, pursuant to

20 Woods v. Carey, No. 09-15548, slip op. 7871, 7884-85 (9th Cir. July 6, 2012), plaintiff must

21 read the following “NOTICE -- WARNING (SUMMARY JUDGMENT),” which is provided to

22 him for a second time pursuant to Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 952, 953-954 (9th Cir. 1998) (en

23 banc), and Klinge v. Eikenberry, 849 F.2d 409, 411-12 (9th Cir. 1988).

24
25
26

NOTICE -- WARNING
(SUMMARY JUDGMENT)

27 If defendants move for summary judgment, they are seeking to have your case dismissed.

28 A motion for summary judgment under Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure will, if granted, end your case.