

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**

NATHAN CHARLES CAREY,)	Case No.: 1:13-cv-00669-SAB (PC)
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
v.)	FOR CLARIFICATION
)	
A. ALPHONSO, et al.,)	[ECF No. 19]
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff Nathan Charles Carey is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Now pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion for clarification, filed August 22, 2014. Plaintiff requests clarification regarding the Court’s August 1, 2014, order striking his response to Defendant’s request for interrogatories. Plaintiff indicates that he only submitted a copy to the Court for posterity and official record.

Plaintiff is again advised that “[d]iscovery propounded on a party is self-executing, and must be served directly on the party from whom discovery is sought; parties should not file copies of their discovery with the court. Local Rules 250.2, 250.3 250.4. Discovery documents inappropriately submitted to the court will be returned or stricken. (ECF NO. 3, ¶ 8) (emphasis in original). Discovery is self-executing until such time as a party becomes dissatisfied with a response and seeks relief from the court pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Interrogatories, requests for

1 admissions, requests for production of documents, and responses thereto shall not be filed with the
2 court until there is a proceeding in which the document or proof of service is at issue. Such documents
3 are only to be served on the opposing party, and not with the Court. Local Rules 250.2, 250.3, 250.4.
4 Discovery requests improperly filed with the court will be, and have been, stricken from the record.
5 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for clarification is DENIED.

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 25, 2014



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE