GREGORY GOODS AA6797
P.O.BOX 4430/A-4-137
LANCASTER , CA 93539

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

GREGORY GOODS,

PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT.

V.

D.C. No. 2:18-CV-00732-JAM-EFB MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE WRIT OF CERTIORARI FROM DENIAL OF REHEARING EN-BANC!

DAVID BAUGHMAN, ET AL., DEFENDANTS∈

DEFENDANTS APPELLEES APPELLEES

Plaintiff/Appellant at this time request for an extension of time to file file writ of certiorari from the denial of rehearing en-banc on [7/18/22], and received by plaintiff on [7/29/22]! Plaintiff request for a extension of time due to other litigation at this time, which requires plaintiff to seek such request at this time due to conflicting deadlines of other litigation, please advise!

This request is being made pursuant to (Rule-29-Sec-2), and in compliance with [28-U.S.C. \S 1746].

OCT 13 2022 OFFICE OF THE CLERK Case: 20-15365, 03/22/2022, ID: 12401423, DktEntry: 26-1, Page 1 of 2

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 22 2022

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

GREGORY GOODS,

No. 20-15365

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:18-cv-00732-JAM-EFB

V.

MEMORANDUM*

DAVID BAUGHMAN, Warden, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California John A. Mendez, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 16, 2022**

Before:

SILVERMAN, MILLER, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Gregory Goods appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging excessive force and deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Gregg v. Haw. Dep't of Pub. Safety*,

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

^{**} The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Case: 20-15365, 03/22/2022, ID: 12401423, DktEntry: 26-1, Page 2 of 2

870 F.3d 883, 886 (9th Cir. 2017) (dismissal as time-barred); *Resnick v. Hayes*, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (9th Cir. 2000) (dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed Goods's action because Goods failed to file his action within the two-year statute of limitations or establish any basis for tolling. *See Wallace v. Kato*, 549 U.S. 384, 387, 394 (2007) (federal courts in § 1983 actions apply the state statute of limitations and borrow applicable tolling provisions from state law); *see also* Cal. Civ. Proc. Code §§ 335.1, 352.1, 352(a) (setting forth two-year statute of limitations for personal injury claims, a two-year maximum statutory tolling due to imprisonment, and the availability of tolling for mental incapacity); *Cervantes v. City of San Diego*, 5 F.3d 1273, 1275-1277 (9th Cir. 1993) (stating California's three-pronged test for equitable tolling and explaining that dismissal may be appropriate when it is evident from the face of the complaint that equitable tolling is unavailable as a matter of law).

AFFIRMED.

Case: 20-15365, 07/18/2022, ID: 12496661, DktEntry: 30, Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FILED

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JUL 18 2022

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

GREGORY GOODS,

No. 20-15365

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:18-cv-00732-JAM-EFB Eastern District of California,

Sacramento

 $V_{\alpha_{i}}$

ORDER

DAVID BAUGHMAN, Warden; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Before: SILVERMAN, MILLER, and BUMATAY, Circuit Judges.

The full court has been advised of the petition for rehearing en banc and no judge has requested a vote on whether to rehear the matter en banc. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 35.

Goods's petition for rehearing en banc (Docket Entry No. 29) is denied.

No further filings will be entertained in this closed case.

PROOF OF SERVICE

(C.C.P. §§1013/a); 2015.5; 28 U.S.C. §1746)

I, <u>GREGORY GOODS AA6797</u> , am over the age of eighteen (18) years, and I (am) (am not) a party to the within cause of action. My address is:			
× × ×	P.O.BOX 4430/A-4-1 LANCASTER, CA 9353		
On, october sri	D, MONDAY, 2022	I served the follo	sing doormantee
			FROM DENIAL OF REHEARING
on the below named in the United State mail addressed as follows:	ndividual(s) by depos in Soledad,Californ	siting true and co ia, with postage	orrect copies thereof in fully prepaid thereon,
	OF THE UNITED STAT . N.E. C. 20543	EQ	
I have read the a the laws of the State of	bove statements and California that the f	declare under the oregoing is true	ne penalty of perjury of and correct.
Executed this 3nd Prison - CSP-L-A. COUNTY,	_day_of_ <u>october</u>	2022-	;-at-Galifornia-State = -

(Signature) Treggy Book