1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
<u>8</u>		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11		
12	BRYAN E. RANSOM,	Case No. 1: 11-cv-0068-AWI-MJS (PC)
13	Plaintiff,	ORDER FOR STATUS UPDATE
14	V.	(ECF NOS. 81, 86)
15	DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND	SEVEN (7) DAY DEADLINE
16	REHABILITATION, et al.,	
17	Defendants.	
18		
19	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil	
20	rights action brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1983. The action proceeds against	
21	Defendants Bondoc, Madina, Swingle, Neubarth, Corea and Dhah on Plaintiff's Eighth	
22	Amendment medical indifference claims. (ECF Nos. 21 & 26.)	
23	Before the Court are two motions to compel filed by Defendants Swingle,	
24	Neubarth, and Bondoc (ECF No. 81) and Madina (ECF No. 86). Both of these motions	
25	object claim that Plaintiff has not responded at all to their discovery requests.	
26	On October 23, 2015, Plaintiff filed a notice indicating that he has responded to	
27	Defendant Greaves was dismissed (ECF No. 67.), a	nd Defendant Punt has defaulted (ECE Nes. 52.9
28	Defendant Greaves was distributed (ECF No. 67.), a	nu Derenuant Funt has defaulted (EOF 1905, 33 &

Defendants Swingle, Neubarth, and Bondoc's discovery requests. (ECF No. 108.) The record also suggests that Plaintiff responded to Defendant Madina's discovery requests in November 2015. (See ECF Nos. 109-110.) Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants Swingle, Neubarth, Bondoc, and Madina apprise the Court within seven (7) days of the status of their respective motions to compel. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: <u>January 23, 2016</u> UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE