| 1        | WO   |                       |
|----------|--|-----------------------|
| 2<br>3   |  |                       |
| 3<br>4   |  |                       |
| 4<br>5   |  |                       |
| 6        |  |                       |
| 7        | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |                       |
| ,<br>8   | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |                       |
| 9        | Barry Louis Lamon,   | No. 1:07-cv-00829-DGC |
| 10       | Plaintiff,   | ORDER                 |
| 11       | vs.  |                       |
| 12       | Derral G. Adams, et al.,   |                       |
| 13       | Defendants.  |                       |
| 14       |  |                       |
| 15       | Plaintiff is confined in the state prison in Corcoran, California. He commenced          |                       |
| 16       | this pro se civil rights action in June 2007 by filing a complaint against several       |                       |
| 17       | correctional officers. Doc. 1. Plaintiff subsequently filed multiple amended complaints. |                       |
| 18       | Docs. 11, 18, 27. On April 10, 2009, the Court issued a screening order requiring        |                       |
| 19       | answers to certain claims asserted in the third amended complaint and dismissing the     |                       |
| 20       | remaining claims without prejudice. Doc. 28. On September 17, 2009, the Court issued     |                       |
| 21       | a case management order setting a May 21, 2010 discovery deadline and a July 23, 2010    |                       |
| 22       | dispositive motion deadline. Doc. 47. Those deadlines subsequently were extended,        |                       |
| 23       | respectively, to August 20 and December 17, 2010. Docs. 68, 92.                          |                       |
| 24       | Pending before the Court are several non-dispositive motions, each of which will         |                       |
| 25<br>26 | be denied. On the last day of the discovery period, Defendants filed a motion to compel  |                       |
| 26<br>27 | discovery responses and for an extension of time to file a further motion to compel.     |                       |
| 27       | Doc. 78. The Court gave Plaintiff until December 3, 2010 to respond to that motion       |                       |
| 28       |  |                       |

(Doc. 92), but this deadline passed without a response having been filed. On November 30, 2010, Plaintiff filed two motions: a motion for injunctive relief in the form of an order requiring prison officials to provide Plaintiff access to the law library (Doc. 94), and a motion for an extension of time to file a motion to compel discovery (Doc. 97).

This case is nearly four years old. The deadline for completing discovery has expired, and a dispositive motion has been filed by Defendants. Doc. 99. Briefing on that motion will be complete by April 5, 2011. *See* Doc. 106. The Court will issue a ruling on the motion shortly thereafter. Given the age of this case, and the fact that a dispositive has been filed, the Court finds the non-dispositive motions to be moot. The Court will not reopen the discovery period or otherwise entertain motions to compel discovery. Plaintiff has filed a full response to the dispositive motion (Doc. 103), rendering moot his request for access to the prison law library.

## **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:**

1. Defendants' motion to compel discovery responses and request for an extension of time (Doc. 78) is **denied**.

Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary
injunction (Doc. 94) is **denied**.

3. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time to file motion to compel discovery (Doc. 97) is **denied**.

Dated this 17th day of March, 2011.

Daniel G. Campbell

David G. Campbell United States District Judge

- 2 -