

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**

GEORGE H. ROBINSON,)	Case No.: 1:08-cv-001380-AWI-BAM PC
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER RE: PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS
)	FOLLOWING <i>IN CAMERA</i> REVIEW
v.)	
)	
D. G. ADAMS, et al.,)	THIRTY DAY DEADLINE
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff George H. Robinson (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action is proceeding on the complaint against Defendants David, Miranda, Melo, Garcia, Mendoza, Martinez and Masiel for use of excessive force in violation of the Eighth Amendment; against Defendants Adams and Ruiz for failure to protect in violation of the Eighth Amendment; and against Defendants Martinez, David, Miranda and Garcia for assault and battery in violation of state law.

On May 17, 2013, the Court issued an order related to an *in camera* review of documents submitted by Defendant Jesse Martinez. At that time, the Court informed the parties of its intended ruling to order that the documents regarding Defendant Martinez’s reprimand for unnecessary use of force in 2008 be produced with all personal information, other than employee names and/or inmate names, redacted. The Court’s intended ruling was issued to allow Defendants sufficient time to request a protective order and to notify any inmates that their information would be provided to

1 Plaintiff pursuant to this Court's order. The Court granted Defendants thirty days in which to apply
2 for further protective order relating to these documents. (ECF No. 175.) Defendants did not apply for
3 a further protective order.

4 On November 6, 2013, the Court directed Defendants to submit a status report regarding the
5 production of documents encompassed by the Court's intended ruling, including whether the relevant
6 documents had been produced or whether a further order of this Court was required. (ECF No. 196.)
7 Defendants filed a response to the Court's order on November 18, 2013. Defendants indicated that
8 they cannot produce the documents that were provided to the Court for *in camera* review without an
9 order from the Court explicitly requiring them to do so and, thus, the documents have not been
10 produced. (ECF No. 200.)

11 Based on Defendants' response and the Court's intended ruling issued on May 17, 2013, it is
12 HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants shall produce the documents submitted for *in camera* review
13 regarding Defendant Martinez's reprimand for unnecessary use of force in 2008 with all personal
14 information, other than employee names and/or inmate names, redacted within thirty (30) days of the
15 date of this order.

16
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: November 20, 2013

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE