

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN WESLEY WILLIAMS,

CASE NO. 1:06-cv-01535-SMS PC

Plaintiff,

ORDER ADDRESSING PLAINTIFF’S  
OBJECTION AND REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO  
COMPLY WITH PROCEDURE SET FORTH IN  
DEFENSE COUNSEL’S LETTER

v.

JEANNE WOODFORD,

(ECF Nos. 93, 94)

Defendants.

Plaintiff John Wesley Williams (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On November 15, 2010, Plaintiff filed a motion for judicial intervention to communicate with incarcerated witnesses. (ECF No.81.) On April 18, 2011, the Court wrote a letter to the wardens at Salinas Valley State Prison and California State Prison, Los Angeles County requesting that they facilitate communication between Plaintiff and his witnesses. (ECF No. 92.) Defense counsel filed a response on May 3, 2011, granting Plaintiff’s request to communicate with his witnesses and setting forth the procedure to be followed. (ECF No. 93.) Plaintiff filed an objection to the procedures on May 17, 2011. (ECF No. 94.) Plaintiff objects to the time frame set forth for inmate communication and that prison officials will review all correspondence claiming that the correspondence is confidential and is entitled to attorney client or work product privilege.

Under no circumstance should Plaintiff expect to be allowed to correspond with his inmate and parolee witnesses in complete confidentiality. As set forth in the Court’s letter, communication is subject to whatever restrictions and procedures prison officials’ deemed appropriate. The Court

1 has *requested* that Plaintiff be granted permission to communicate with his witnesses. How prison  
2 officials choose to accommodate this request rests soundly in their discretion.

3 The Court has reviewed the procedure proposed by Defendants' counsel in the letter dated  
4 May 3, 2011, and finds it to be reasonable and acceptable. Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED  
5 that Plaintiff shall comply with the procedure set forth in defense counsel's letter dated May 3, 2011.

6  
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 **Dated:** May 26, 2011

/s/ Sandra M. Snyder  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28