

1 WO
2
3
4
5

6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 Joseph Gerald Eldridge,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 Charles L. Ryan, et al.,

13 Defendants.
14

No. CV-13-00888-PHX-DLR (ESW)

ORDER

15
16 Plaintiff is an inmate in custody at the Arizona Department of Corrections in
17 Florence, Arizona. On April 30, 2013, Plaintiff filed a Complaint (Doc. 1) alleging a
18 violation of his civil rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendants filed an Answer
19 (Doc. 29) to Plaintiff's Complaint. A final amended scheduling Order (Doc. 103) was
20 issued on June 11, 2014. The deadline for all discovery closed on June 27, 2014.
21 Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. 128) was fully briefed on December 3,
22 2014 and is currently pending before the Court.

23 Plaintiff filed a Motion to Compel (Doc. 135) on October 24, 2014, requesting that
24 the Court order the Defendants to allow Plaintiff to speak to advisory counsel or any
25 attorney from the Arizona State Bar. Plaintiff further requests that the Court order
26 Defendants to stop holding Plaintiff's incoming "mail and legal" in the mail room for
27 more than 24 hours after receipt from the United States Postal Service. Defendants filed a
28 Response to Motion to Compel (Doc. 139) on November 10, 2014.

1 Pursuant to Rule 37(a), Fed.R.Civ.P., a party may move for an order compelling
2 disclosure or discovery in a case. However, Plaintiff does not seek the discovery or the
3 disclosure of information that is relevant to his case in Motion to Compel (Doc. 135).
4 Instead, Plaintiff seeks access to counsel and faster receipt of mail. Such relief is not
5 available in a motion to compel discovery. Plaintiff is not represented by counsel in this
6 case. His multiple prior requests for the appointment of counsel were denied by orders of
7 the Court dated August 15, 2013 (Doc. 12), September 10, 2013 (Doc. 19), November 19,
8 2013 (Doc. 36), January 2, 2014 (Doc. 53), April 1, 2014 (Doc. 81), June 11, 2014 (Doc.
9 103) and August 12, 2014 (Doc. 123). Nor is the speed by which Plaintiff receives his
10 mail related to discovery in this case. Plaintiff does not allege that he failed to timely
11 receive discovery to which he was entitled due to the processing of his mail. Therefore,

12 IT IS ORDERED denying Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (Doc. 135) as it relates to
13 discovery in this case.

14 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED referring the Motion to Compel (Doc. 135) to Pro Se
15 Staff Attorneys for consideration as a request by Plaintiff for injunctive relief.

16 Dated this 23rd day of December, 2014.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


Honorable Eileen S. Willett
United States Magistrate Judge

cc: Pro Se Staff Attorneys