

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
9

10 DOUGAL SAMUELS,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 PAM AHLIN, et al.,

14 Defendants.  
15

Case No. 1:10-cv-00585-DAD-EPG (PC)

ORDER FOLLOWING INITIAL  
SCHEDULING CONFERENCE

16 Dougalsamuels (“Plaintiff”) is a civil detainee proceeding *pro se* and *in forma*  
17 *pauperis* in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 27, 2019,  
18 the Court held an Initial Scheduling Conference (“Conference”). Plaintiff telephonically  
19 appeared on his own behalf. Counsel Christine Murphy telephonically appeared on behalf of  
20 the State Defendants. Counsel Scott Hawkins telephonically appeared on behalf of the County  
21 Defendants.

22 During the Conference, and with the benefit of the scheduling conference statements  
23 provided by the parties, the Court and the parties discussed relevant documents in this case and  
24 their possible locations. In addition to opening discovery generally, the Court ordered that  
25 certain documents that are central to the dispute be promptly produced.

26 Therefore, in an effort to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive disposition of this

27 ///

1 action,<sup>1</sup> and after consideration of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(1),<sup>2</sup> IT IS ORDERED<sup>3</sup>  
2 that:

- 3 1. Plaintiff has thirty days from the date of service of this order to serve Defendants  
4 with a supplement to his initial disclosures.
- 5 2. If any party subpoenas and receives documents relevant to this case, that party  
6 shall promptly produce those documents to all other parties. If the producing  
7 party believes there is some basis to withhold some or all of those documents, the  
8 producing party must file a notice with the Court.

9  
10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: March 5, 2019

12 /s/ Eric P. Grogan  
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

14  
15  
16 <sup>1</sup> See, e.g., *United States v. W.R. Grace*, 526 F.3d 499, 508–09 (9th Cir. 2008) (“We begin with the  
17 principle that the district court is charged with effectuating the speedy and orderly administration of justice. There  
18 is universal acceptance in the federal courts that, in carrying out this mandate, a district court has the authority to  
19 enter pretrial case management and discovery orders designed to ensure that the relevant issues to be tried are  
adequately and timely prepared so that the trial can proceed efficiently and intelligibly.”).

20 <sup>2</sup> Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26 provides that “[p]arties may obtain discovery regarding any  
21 nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party’s claim or defense and proportional to the needs of the case,  
22 considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties’ relative  
23 access to relevant information, the parties’ resources, the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues, and  
24 whether the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1).  
“Information within this scope of discovery need not be admissible in evidence to be discoverable.” *Ibid.*

25 <sup>3</sup> Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16, “[a]t any pretrial conference, the court may consider  
26 and take appropriate action on the following matters: . . . controlling and scheduling discovery, including orders  
27 affecting disclosures and discovery under Rule 26 and Rules 29 through 37” and “facilitating in other ways the  
28 just, speedy, and inexpensive disposition of the action.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(c)(2)(F). See also *Little v. City of  
Seattle*, 863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir. 1988) (“The district court has wide discretion in controlling discovery.”).  
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16 vests the district court with early control over cases “toward a process of  
judicial management that embraces the entire pretrial phase, especially motions and discovery.” *In re Arizona*,  
528 F.3d 652, 655 (9th Cir. 2008) (affirming district court’s requiring that prison officials prepare a *Martinez*  
report to give detailed factual information involving a prisoner’s suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and stating “district  
courts have wide latitude in controlling discovery.”). See also Advisory Committee Notes to 1993 Amendment to  
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure regarding Rule 26(a) (“The enumeration in Rule 26(a) of items to be disclosed  
does not prevent a court from requiring by order or local rule that the parties disclosed additional information  
without a discovery request.”).