Fisher v. Caruso, et al Doc. 29

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

FREDERICK FISHER,

Plaintiff,	CIVIL ACTION NO. 08-10894
V.	DISTRICT JUDGE PAUL D. BORMAN MAGISTRATE JUDGE DONALD A. SCHEER
PATRICIA CARUSO, et. al.,	
Defendants.	

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STAY PROCEEDINGS

This cause comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Stay Further Proceedings dated September 15, 2008 (Docket #28). Plaintiff was allowed to proceed in forma pauperis and filed the instant Complaint, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, on March 4, 2008, against the Director of the Michigan Department of Corrections (MDOC) and fourteen MDOC officials employed at the Ryan Correctional Facility in Detroit, Michigan. Plaintiff alleges that he had been the victim of retaliation by these defendants for filing prison grievances and lawsuits against them.

Defendants filed a Motion for Summary Judgment on August 18, 2008, asserting that Plaintiff had failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Docket # 24). Plaintiff was given until September 19, 2008, to file a response to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Docket # 26). Instead of filing a response, Plaintiff filed the instant motion seeking an indefinite stay of proceedings. He claims, without providing any verification, that he is currently in settlement negotiations with the MDOC.

Given the lack of substantiation in the form of a stipulation between the parties that

the instant case is close to being settled, Plaintiff's Motion to Stay Proceedings is DENIED.

Plaintiff is HEREBY ORDERED to file a response to Defendants' Motion for Summary

Judgment, with a brief and opposing affidavits, on or before October 20, 2008.

The parties to this action may object to and seek review of this Order but are

required to act within ten (10) days of service of a copy hereof as provided for in

Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(a) and E.D.Mich.LR 72.1(d)(1). Failure to file specific objections

constitutes a waiver of any further right of appeal. I 72. Filing of objections that raise some

issues but fail to raise others with specificity, will not preserve all the objections a party

might have to this Order. Pursuant to E.D. Mich. LR 72.1(d)(1), a copy of any objection is

to be served upon this Magistrate Judge.

Within ten (10) days of service of any objecting party's timely filed objections, the

opposing party may file a response. The response shall address specifically, and in the

same order raised, each issue contained within the objections.

SO ORDERED.

s/Donald A. Scheer DONALD A. SCHEER UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DATED: October 6, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify on October 6, 2008 that I electronically filed the foregoing paper with the Clerk of the Court sending notification of such filing to all counsel registered electronically. I hereby certify that a copy of this paper was mailed to the following nonregistered ECF participants on October 6, 2008. Frederick Fisher.

> s/Michael E. Lang Deputy Clerk to Magistrate Judge Donald A. Scheer (313) 234-5217