

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 RUBEN DARIO GARCIA, JR,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 A. CHANDRA, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

No. 2:22-cv-1221 TLN CSK P

ORDER

17 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel. On May 19, 2026, this Court
18 ordered the parties to file supplemental briefs addressing whether any of plaintiff's claims are
19 barred by the Heck v. Humphrey doctrine. (ECF No. 84.) On June 8, 2026, plaintiff filed a
20 request for a 45 day extension of time to file his supplemental brief. (ECF No. 86.) However, on
21 June 2, 2026, defendants filed their supplemental brief stating that because plaintiff is serving a
22 sentence of life without the possibility of parole, the loss of good-time credits would have no
23 actual mathematical effect on the duration of plaintiff's sentence, and therefore the Heck v.
24 Humphrey doctrine does not apply. (ECF No. 85 (citing Ramirez v. Galaza, 334 F.3d 850, 856
25 (9th Cir. 2003)).)

26 This Court agrees with defendants. Because plaintiff is sentenced to life without parole,
27 the disciplinary sanctions imposed on plaintiff would not affect the duration of his sentence, and
28 therefore the Heck v. Humphrey doctrine does not bar plaintiff's claims. Ramirez, 334 F.3d at

1 856. Therefore, the Court relieves plaintiff of his obligation to file a supplemental brief, so no
2 extension of time is needed, and his request for extension of time is denied as moot.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

4 1. Plaintiff is relieved of his obligation to file a supplemental brief as required by the May
5 19, 2026 (ECF No. 84); and

6 2. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 86) is denied.
7

8 Dated: June 16, 2026

9 
10 CHI SOO KIM
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12 /l/garc1221.36d
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28