

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

FLOYD SCOTT,

Plaintiff,

v.

J. PALMER, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:09-cv-01329-LJO-SKO (PC)

ORDER ADDRESSING MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION

(Doc. 135)

Plaintiff Floyd Scott, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on July 29, 2009. This action for damages is proceeding against Defendants Palmer, Rivera, and Lopez on Plaintiff's claim that while he was at Kern Valley State Prison in Delano, California, Defendant Palmer used excessive physical force against him and Defendants Rivera and Lopez failed to intervene, in violation of his rights under the Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

On March 13, 2013, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking clarification regarding the extension of time granted to Defendants to serve their discovery responses. (Doc. 135.) Plaintiff's point in the main is that the extension was granted before Plaintiff had the opportunity to file an opposition. Local Rule 230(l). The Court is vested with broad discretion to manage discovery, *Dichter-Mad Family Partners, LLP v. U.S.*, 709 F.3d 749, 751 (9th Cir. 2013) (per curiam), *cert. denied*, 134 S.Ct. 117; *Hunt v. Cnty. of Orange*, 672 F.3d 606, 616 (9th Cir. 2012); *Survivor Media, Inc. v. Survivor Prods.*, 406 F.3d 625, 635 (9th Cir. 2005); *Hallett v. Morgan*, 296 F.3d 732, 751 (9th Cir.

