

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

<b>SHELDON WALKER,</b>	)	
	)	<b>2:10-CV-1408 JWS - LOA</b>
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>vs.</b>	)	<b>ORDER AND OPINION</b>
	)	
<b>CHARLES L. RYAN, et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	
	)	

This matter is on referral to Magistrate Judge Anderson for pre-trial proceedings. In an order at docket 125, the magistrate granted in part and denied in part plaintiff Walker’s motion to compel defendants to respond to certain discovery requests. At docket 129, plaintiff asks this court to review Magistrate Judge Anderson’s order. When evaluating a request to review such a decision by a magistrate judge, this court examines the record to determine whether the magistrate judge’s order was clearly erroneous or contrary to law. 28 U.S.C. § 636.

To begin with, this court finds that the order at docket 125 is not contrary to law. The magistrate judge identified the correct legal standard in Section II. of his order and correctly discussed the “meet and confer” requirement applicable to discovery motions in Section III, A. Furthermore, the magistrate judge correctly identified what claims remain for resolution and tied his decision to those claims. See Section III. B.

The order goes on to carefully address each disputed discovery request. In resolving each dispute, the magistrate judge's decisions appear correct. They certainly are not clearly erroneous. Rather, as this court reads the order, the magistrate judge did an excellent job in articulating sound reasons for his ruling on each of the disputed items.

Finding that Magistrate Judge Anderson's order was not contrary to law, and further finding that none of his rulings are clearly erroneous, this court will deny the motion for review at docket 129.

For the reasons above, the motion at docket 129 is **DENIED**.

DATED this 14<sup>th</sup> day of June 2012.

/s/ JOHN W. SEDWICK  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE