

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**

LEONARDO JOSEPH RANGEL,	)	Case No.: 1:10-cv-01790-AWI-BAM PC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO
	)	COMPEL DEFENDANTS TO SUPPLY C-FILE
v.	)	(ECF No. 75)
	)	
D. LATRAILLE, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff Leonardo Joseph Rangel (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On June 27, 2013, the Court issued an order that required defense counsel to arrange for Plaintiff to view the non-confidential portions of his c-file and obtain copies of those documents, including his CDCR 114-A and 114-A1 entries (or documents) relevant to this action within twenty-one (21) days. (ECF No. 68, pp. 3-4.) The Court also indicated that Plaintiff may contact defense counsel to arrange for viewing of his videotaped extraction and, if necessary, renew his request to compel such viewing. (ECF No. 68, p. 11.)

On August 1, 2013, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel review and copies of his c-file as ordered by the Court. Plaintiff contends that he was not allowed to review any documents in the file. Although he was able to itemize documents for copying, he was denied copies due to a lack of funds. (ECF No. 75.) On March 17, 2014, the Court directed Defendants to file a response to Plaintiff’s

1 motion to compel. (ECF No. 81.) On March 24, 2014, Defendants filed their opposition to Plaintiff's  
2 motion to compel. (ECF No. 83.) The Court does not find a reply necessary and the motion to compel  
3 is deemed submitted. Local Rule 230(l).

4 Defendants have submitted evidence of the following:

5 On June 28, 2013, the day after the Court's discovery order, the paralegal assigned to this  
6 matter sent an e-mail to the Litigation Coordinator at California State Prison-Corcoran regarding the  
7 Court's order and requesting that Plaintiff be given an opportunity to review his central file, including  
8 the relevant 114As and A1s, and view the videotape of his extraction. (ECF No. 83, p. 7, Ex. A.)

9 On July 5, 2013, the Litigation Coordinator advised that Plaintiff had been allowed to view the  
10 extraction video and that Plaintiff's review of his central file would take place before July 18, 2013.  
11 (ECF No. 83, p. 9, Ex. B.)

12 On July 15, 2013, Plaintiff reviewed his central file, supervised by his Correctional Counselor,  
13 D. McGuire. (ECF No. 83, p. 11, Ex. C.) Although Plaintiff's request for copies was originally  
14 denied, the denial was rescinded and Counselor McGuire was awaiting further instructions regarding  
15 the copies. (ECF No. 83, p. 2.)

16 Defendants conclude that Plaintiff was provided with an opportunity to view his central file,  
17 obtain copies of the 114A and A1 material to the matters at issue and to review the extraction video.  
18 (ECF No. 83, P. 3.) Defendants also state that they provided documents to Plaintiff.

19 Based on the foregoing, the Court finds that Defendants have complied with the Court's June  
20 27, 2013 order. The Court therefore declines Plaintiff's request for a complete copy of his central file,  
21 and his motion to compel, filed on August 1, 2013, is HEREBY DENIED.

22  
23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: March 24, 2014

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe  
25 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE