1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 7 8 Case No. 08cv0859 RTB (PCL) 9 KENNETH L. HOWARD, ORDER GRANTING Plaintiff. 10 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY 11 v. 12 A. HEDGPETH, et al., 13 Defendants. (Doc. No. 37) 14 15 Plaintiff Kenneth L. Howard, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed a civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on June 19, 2008. (Doc. No. 10.) On June 16 1, 2010, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Compel Discovery seeking responses to outstanding 17 18 Interrogatories, Requests for Productions of Documents and Requests for Admissions. (Doc. 19 No. 37.) The Court issued a Briefing Schedule requiring Defendants to Oppose Plaintiff's Motion or indicate their non-opposition to the Court by June 22, 2010. However, Defendants 20 failed to respond to the Court's Order by that date. (See Doc. No. 41.) On July 9, 2010, Plaintiff 21 filed a timely Motion for Sanctions requesting imposition of sanctions on Defendants for failure 22 23 to comply with the Court's Order. (Doc. No. 40.) 24 Thereafter, on July 15, 2010, the Court held a telephonic Mandatory Settlement Conference during which the parties were present via telephone and advised the Court of the 25 26 status of this case. At this Conference, defense counsel indicated non-opposition to the Motion 27 to Compel and requested ten (10) days to produce the requested responses. 28

After reviewing the Motion to Compel Discovery, Motion for Sanctions and Defendants' Statement of Non-Opposition to the Motion to Compel, and being advised of the status of the case, Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Discovery is GRANTED in its entirety. Defendants must produce all discovery indicated in Plaintiff's Motion by <u>July 26, 2010</u>. The Court takes Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions under submission at this time.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: <u>July 15, 2010</u>

U.S. Magistrate Judge United States District Court

cc: The Honorable Roger T. Benitez
All Parties and Counsel of Record