

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
GAINESVILLE DIVISION**

DUKE F. CRANFORD,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CASE NO. 1:09CV70-MP/AK

A.D. HAMMOCK, et al,

Defendants.

_____ /

ORDER

Plaintiff moves for leave to correspond with 14 inmates and 4 chapel clerks for purposes of preparing for trial, but he does not offer any particulars about what information these persons, whom he refers to as “potential witnesses,” might have that would support the claims made in this lawsuit. (Doc. 60). Plaintiff also does not explain why he has delayed in seeking this information, when discovery expired on December 14, 2009. (See Doc. 44). Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment on October 21, 2009, (doc. 46), and Plaintiff has responded to it. As the Court stated in its previous order, (doc. 59), which it assumes has not yet been received by Plaintiff, no further motions should be filed by Plaintiff until the Court rules on the pending motion for summary judgment. If the motion is denied, the Court will allow Plaintiff additional time to prepare for trial, but any witness list is premature at this point and it is too late to obtain affidavits from these inmates and others in support of his response to the motion

for summary judgment. The process for inmate to inmate communication is time consuming, and Plaintiff has made no explanation for why he waited until after discovery to consider this process, especially if the “potential witnesses” have information important to his case.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED:

Plaintiff’s motion (doc. 60) is **DENIED**.

DONE AND ORDERED this 8th day of January, 2010.

s/ A. KORNBLUM

ALLAN KORNBLUM
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE