

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

MARCUS R. WILLIAMS,
Plaintiff,

v.

KELLY HARRINGTON, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:12-cv-00226 LJO DLB PC

ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO COMPEL AND DIRECTING
DEFENDANTS TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
SANCTIONS SHOULD NOT BE IMPOSED

[ECF No. 65]

Plaintiff Marcus R. Williams is a prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action.

On January 20, 2015, the Court issued an order granting Plaintiff's motions to compel and ordering Defendants to respond within thirty days to Plaintiff's first set of discovery requests which were served on March 19, 2014. On March 6, 2015, Plaintiff filed the instant motion to compel. Defendants did not file an opposition. The motion to compel is deemed submitted pursuant to Local Rule 230(1).

Plaintiff states that Defendants have failed to respond to his first set of discovery requests as ordered by the Court. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2)(A), the failure to comply with an order to provide or permit discovery may be cause for appropriate sanctions. It appearing that Defendants have failed to abide by the Court's order of January 20, 2015, compelling Defendants

1 to respond to Plaintiff's first set of discovery requests served on March 19, 2014, Defendants are
2 hereby ORDERED to SHOW CAUSE why appropriate sanctions should not be imposed.

3
4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: April 22, 2015

/s/ Dennis L. Beck
6 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28