

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
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

PETER J. HELFRICH,
Plaintiff,
v.
DWIGHT NEVEN et al.,
Defendants.

2:14-cv-1725-RFB-NJK

ORDER

I. DISCUSSION

Plaintiff has filed a motion for a speedy trial, a motion for judicial notice, and a motion for submission. (ECF Nos. 48, 52, 53).

The Court denies Plaintiff’s motion for a speedy trial. (ECF No. 48). The right to a speedy trial only applies to criminal cases and this is a civil case. See U.S. Const. amend. VI (stating that “[i]n all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial . . .”).

The Court denies Plaintiff’s motions for judicial notice and submission. (ECF Nos. 52, 53). Based on the motions, which are identical, it appears that Plaintiff has attempted to transcribe illegible doctors’ reports by hand because prison officials failed to provide him access to the typed or transcribed versions. (ECF No. 52, at 2). Although the Court acknowledges that Plaintiff has attempted to interpret the doctors’ reports himself, the Court does not accept Plaintiff’s interpretations and will review the reports itself.

///

///

///

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

II. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons,

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for a speedy trial (ECF No. 48) is DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for judicial notice (ECF No. 52) is DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for submission (ECF No. 53) is DENIED.

DATED: This 5th day of February, 2015.



NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge