

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

COLIN M. RANDOLPH,
Plaintiff,
v.
B. NIX, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:12-cv-00392-LJO-MJS (PC)

**ORDER REQUIRING PLAINTIFF TO
REPLY TO DEFENDANT’S RESPONSE
TO MOTION FOR THE ATTENDANCE OF
INCARCERATED WITNESS**

(ECF No. 116)

Plaintiff is a state prisoner represented by court appointed counsel, and is proceeding with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The action proceeds against Defendant Akanno on Plaintiff’s Eighth Amendment medical indifference claim and is set for trial on August 23, 2016.

On April 26, 2016, Plaintiff filed a motion to secure the attendance of inmate witness Dupriest Green at trial. On May 25, 2016, Defendant responded with a statement of no objection to Green’s testimony, but requested that Green testify through video conference on safety and security grounds.

The Court’s scheduling order did not provide for Plaintiff to file a reply regarding motions for the attendance of incarcerated witnesses. However, a reply on this issue will be helpful. Accordingly, Plaintiff is **HEREBY ORDERED** to file a reply to Defendant’s

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

response on or before May 31, 2016, setting forth therein objections, if any he has, to the presentation of Green's testimony through video conference.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 25, 2016

/s/ Michael J. Seng
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE