

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHARLES AUSTIN PARKS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

1: 08 CV 01628 LJO YNP SMS (PC)

ORDER RE MOTION (DOC 29)

D. ADAMS, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the court is Plaintiff’s motion to compel filed on February 5, 2010.

Plaintiff has filed a document styled as a motion to compel Defendants to provide further answers to his discovery requests. Plaintiff specifically seeks an order compelling Defendants Braswell, Young, Hien, Pighting, Alexander and John Doe “to serve verified responses with out objections to Plaintiff’s demand for production of documents set (1) one.” Defendants have opposed the motion.

Plaintiff contends that on October 15, 2009, he served Defendants with a request for production of documents “that consisted of 20 clear and concise requests for documents.” Plaintiff attaches his request as an exhibit to his motion. In his motion, Plaintiff appears to make

1 arguments regarding Defendants' objections. Plaintiff does not, however, specify the particular  
2 request at issue. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a), and Local Rules 33-250(c)  
3 and 36-250(c), Plaintiff must set forth in his motion each interrogatory and the response at issue.  
4 Defendants note that Plaintiff's motion does not identify what type of discovery requests are at  
5 issue. Plaintiff accuses defense counsel of acting in bad faith and failing to fulfill Defendants'  
6 discovery obligations.

7 Plaintiff makes no showing that Defendants have refused to answer his requests. Plaintiff  
8 appears to challenge objections asserted by Defendants. Defendants have fulfilled their  
9 discovery obligations. If plaintiff seeks to challenge a particular objection, he must include with  
10 his motion the discovery request, the specific objection, and an argument as to why the objection  
11 should be overruled. Plaintiff has failed to do so here, and the motion should therefore be  
12 denied.

13 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to compel filed on  
14 February 5, 2010, is DENIED.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 **Dated:** March 1, 2010

/s/ Sandra M. Snyder  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE