1		
2 3		
3 4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STAT	TES DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	HUSSEIN ALI KIETTY,	) Case No.: 1:13-cv-00312-LJO-SAB (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	) ) ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
13	v.	) TO COMPEL
14	A. WALKER, et al.,	) [ECF No. 36]
15	Defendants.	) )
16		
17	Plaintiff Hussein Ali Kietty is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action	
18	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.	
19	On May 4, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel discovery. Defendants filed an opposition	
20	on May 15, 2015. The motion is deemed submitted to the Court for review pursuant to Local Rule	
21	230(1).	
22	Plaintiff seeks to compel Defendants to respond to his request for interrogatories sent on	
23	February 2, 2015.	in the state of the sector of the state of t
24	Pursuant to the Court's June 2, 2014, discovery and scheduling order, the deadline for	
25 26	completion of all discovery, including motions to compel, was set for February 2, 2015. (ECF No.	
20 27	16.) Pursuant to this order, responses to written discovery requests are due forty-five days after the request is first served. ( <u>Id.</u> ) In this instance, the last day to serve discovery requests was December	
27	19, 2014, to allow for the forty-five day response period. ( <u>Id.</u> )	
20	1, 2011, to allow for the forty five day respon	1
	1	-

1	Although Plaintiff requested an extension of the discovery deadline, the request was denied on	
2	the basis that Plaintiff failed to present good cause for such extension. (ECF Nos. 32, 33.) Therefore,	
3	discovery concluded on February 2, 2015. Plaintiff did not propound his discovery in a timely manner	
4	by following the procedure as outlined in the Court's June 2, 2014, order. Accordingly, Plaintiff's	
5	discovery request was untimely, and the motion to compel must be DENIED.	
6		
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
8	Dated: June 2, 2015	
9	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	2	