

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ALFONSO JACKSON,)	3:10-cv-00771-LRH-WGC
)	
Plaintiff,)	<u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u>
)	
vs.)	August 6, 2013
)	
JOHN DOE, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE LYNN OGDEN 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 "Emergency Motion Requesting the Court to Enter an Order of Contempt Against Defendants and NDOC for Failure to Comply with Court Orders #122, # 126 and # 132." (Doc. 136). Defendants have responded and oppose plaintiff's motion. (Doc. # 139).

The gravamen of Plaintiff's motion is that NDOC (and not necessarily the Defendants herein) have allegedly failed to comply with certain court orders granting Plaintiff an extension of his copywork account. However, as Defendants note in their response, the documents Plaintiff himself submits with his motion (Exhibits A & B to Doc. # 136) explain that Plaintiff has had available to him the sum of \$19.50 for copywork and that there is no limit for supplies (Exhibit. A to Doc. # 136). While there may have been some confusion as to case numbers, Exhibit B clarifies the amount of the extension, i.e., \$19.50. In fact, the legal copywork amount was again increased by \$15.00 by reason of this court's order of April 8, 2013 (Doc. # 132), thereby raising the total copywork available to Plaintiff to \$34.50. (Footnote 3, Doc. # 139). (The discrepancy between the \$19.50 amount referred to in NDOC's responses to Plaintiff's "kites," Exhibits A & B, is likely explained by the delay in processing the court's \$15.00 extension which was entered on April 8. The two NDOC responses re the amount of the copywork funds are dated April 8 and April 12, 2013). The Declaration accompanying Defendants' response, Doc. # 139-1, indicates Plaintiff Jackson since April 11, 2013, has not made any requests for any legal supplies or legal photocopies (id. at para 11). Therefore, there is no basis for Plaintiff's motion for contempt for failure to comply with certain court orders regarding copywork and Plaintiff's motion, # 136 is **DENIED**.

