| 1 | | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|--|--|
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | | |
| 9 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | FRED GOMEZ, | Case No. 1:11-cv-01436-AWI-DLB (PC) | | | |
| 12 | Plaintiff, | ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO | | | |
| 13 | V. | COMPEL AS PREMATURE | | | |
| 14 | SWAIM, et al., | (ECF No. 24) | | | |
| 15 | Defendants. | | | | |
| 16 | Plaintiff Fred Gomez ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma | | | | |
| 17 | pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant | to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On March 28, 2013, Plaintiff | | | |
| 18 | filed a motion to compel Defendant to respo | ed a motion to compel Defendant to respond to his interrogatories and his various requests for | | | |
| 19 | production of documents. (ECF No. 24.) | | | | |
| 20 | Plaintiff served his first set of discovery requests on Defendant Swaim in September and | | | | |
| 21 | October 2012. (ECF No. 24. at 9, 18.) At the time, discovery was proceeding in keeping with the | | | | |
| 22 | Court's Discovery and Scheduling Order, iss | urt's Discovery and Scheduling Order, issued in connection with Plaintiff's original complaint. | | | |
| 23 | (ECF No. 15.) Before Defendant's response | F No. 15.) Before Defendant's responses were due, however, the Court granted Plaintiff's | | | |
| 24 | request to file an amended complaint, and the | st to file an amended complaint, and the Court set about screening that new complaint. (ECF | | | |
| 25 | No. 22 at 2.) | | | | |
| 26 | This case is now proceeding on Plaintiff's amended complaint. Plaintiff's original | | | | |
| 27 | complaint, and the discovery requests served in connection with it, have been superceded by the | | | | |
| 28 | | 1 | | | |
| | | * | | | |

| complaint supercedes the original, the latter being treated thereafter as non-existent"). Discovery and streated after the new Defendants have been served; after they have answ amended complaint; and after the Court has issued a new Discovery and Scheduling | ered the g Order. |
|--|-------------------|
| | g Order. |
| 4 amended complaint; and after the Court has issued a new Discovery and Scheduling | |
| | NIED as |
| 5 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion to compel, filed March 28, 2013, is HEREBY DE | |
| 6 premature. | |
| 7 | |
| 8 IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 9 Dated: March 31, 2014 /s/ Dennis L. Beck | |
| 10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUE |)GE |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |