



1 This action is proceeding on Plaintiff's claim that Defendants were deliberately indifferent to  
2 his serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment, between June 11, 2009 and  
3 December 21, 2009, while he was incarcerated at California Substance Abuse and Treatment Facility  
4 (CSATF) in Corcoran, California. Both of the RVRs relate to Plaintiff's claims that he was not  
5 provided adequate medical care.

6 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26 provides guidance on the scope of discovery permitted:

7 Parties may obtain discovery regarding any nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party's  
8 claim or defense and proportional to the needs of the case, considering the importance of the  
9 issues at stake in the action, the amount in controversy, the parties' relative access to relevant  
10 information, the parties' resources, the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues, and  
11 whether the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit.

12 Information within the scope of discovery need not be admissible in evidence to be  
13 discoverable.

14 Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). Here, although Plaintiff submits that he was found not guilty of the August  
15 25, 2019 violation, for manipulation of staff, he provides no authority to limit the information at this  
16 juncture. Indeed, Plaintiff does not specify what limitations to be placed on the admissibility of the  
17 RVRs. Rather, Plaintiff merely cites his information and belief. However, information may be  
18 discoverable even if not admissible. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for court order of limited  
19 admissibility is DENIED.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21 Dated: October 16, 2019



22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE