## 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 11 WILLIAM RAY JONES, SR., Case No.: 1:12-cv-00633 - AWI - JLT 12 Plaintiff, ORDER DISREGARDING THE REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF SECURITY FILM 13 v. (Doc. 70) 14 LEHIGH SOUTHWEST CEMENT COMPANY, INC., 15 Defendant. 16 17 18 On August 15, 2013, Helena Jones, wife of Plaintiff William Jones, Sr., filed a request for a 19 review of the Court's security film for July 24, 2013. (Doc. 70). Ms. Jones, who is not a party to this 20 action, asserts review of the film footage is necessary to establish that she and Plaintiff filed Plaintiff's 21 initial disclosure at the courthouse in this action on that date, because she did not see the filing on PACER. Id. 22 23 First, Mrs. Jones is not a party in this case and lacks standing to file motions in this action. 24 Second, Plaintiff's filing was filed on July 23, 2013 and is reflected on the docket at entry number 69. 25

26

27

28

Plaintiff is reminded that discovery documents *are not* to be filed with the Court. (Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d)(1) "[Dlisclosures under Rule 26(a)(1) or (2) and the following discovery requests and responses must not be filed until they are used in the proceeding or the court orders filing: depositions, interrogatories, requests for documents or tangible things or to permit entry onto land, and requests for admission.) Thus, discovery documents may be filed *only* when they constitute evidence

1	Therefore, the request for review of the Court's security film is <b>DISREGARDED</b> .
2	
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.
4	Dated: August 19, 2013 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
5	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	supporting a motion or the Court otherwise orders. Any further discovery documents sought to be filed will be rejected.