

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

STEVE MICHAEL COX,	)	3:08-cv-00502-LRH-VPC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	<b><u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u></b>
v.	)	
	)	
JAMES BENEDETTI,	)	
et al.,	)	July 29, 2011
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE VALERIE P. COOKE, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: LISA MANN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

**MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:**

Before the court is plaintiff's "motion for court's clerk(s) to provide plaintiff copies of documents/exhibits due to delays, denials, etc. of access to photocopying (5-23-11) court order (#87)" (#94). Defendants did not oppose.

Plaintiff filed a motion for copies of his preliminary opposition to defendants' summary judgment motion and exhibits, stating that defendants did not comply with the court's May 23, 2011 order (#87), which compelled them to direct ESP to provide plaintiff with a ten dollar photocopy allowance (#94). Defendants did not oppose the motion, but did file a response to plaintiff's third request for an extension of time, noting that defendants' counsel failed to direct ESP to comply with the court's order to provide plaintiff with legal supplies (#91, p. 2). Defendants explained that due to this oversight plaintiff received his legal supplies eight days after the court entered its order, on June 1, 2011. *Id.* Plaintiff filed his opposition to defendants' summary judgment motion on June 9, 2011, along with the instant motion (#95).

While it appears that plaintiff had access to his photocopy allowance in time for the filing of his opposition, in an abundance of caution, the court directs the clerk's office to supply plaintiff with a copy of his opposition and exhibits (#'s 95, 95-1, 95-2, 95-3, 95-4).

**IT IS ORDERED** that the court grants plaintiff's motion for copies (#94).

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the clerk's office shall mail plaintiff copies of docket

