

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

ERIC CHARLES RODNEY KNAPP,

Plaintiff,

v.

MATTHEW CATE, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:08-cv-01779-BAM PC

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS’ MOTION  
TO STAY DISCOVERY

(ECF No. 103)

FOURTEEN DAY DEADLINE

Plaintiff Eric Charles Rodney Knapp (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action is proceeding on the third amended complaint, filed September 29, 2010, against Defendants Koenig, Pate, Otto, Backlund, Roberson, Clay, Gibb, Hannah, Semsen, Lyons, and Esquer for deliberate indifference to Plaintiff’s need for single cell status in violation of the Eighth Amendment. On March 5, 2012, an order issued opening discovery in this action. (ECF No. 92.) On March 9, 2012, Defendants filed a motion to revoke Plaintiff’s in forma pauperis status. (ECF No. 96.) On May 18, 2012, Defendants filed a motion for a protective order. (ECF No. 103.)

Defendants move for a protective order from discovery propounded by Plaintiff in this action. Defendants request that the discovery in this action be stayed until the Court resolves the motion to revoke Plaintiff’s in forma pauperis status and for an order limiting Plaintiff to twenty five requests for admission and requiring him to reformulate his requests so they are straightforward and factual.

“Upon motion by a party or by the person from whom discovery is sought . . . , and for good cause shown, the court . . . may make any order which justice requires to protect a party or person

