1 2

. .

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEVEN R. EDWARDS,

Plaintiff,

ORDER DIRECTING DEFENDANTS TO
RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
FURTHER DISCLOSURE

A. DESFOSSES, et al.,

Defendants.

(ECF NO. 54)

RESPONSE DUE IN SEVEN DAYS

On January 15, 2016, Plaintiff filed a motion titled as a "motion seeking full disclosure of Dr. Ugueze, name, background, disciplinary history with inmates, medical board, sues [sic] and judgments."

On January 4, 2016, Plaintiff received the disclosure of expert witnesses from defense counsel. Plaintiff contends that he was not allowed to obtain the full name of the expert, as well as other information Plaintiff needs to prepare for trial. Plaintiff seeks disclosure of the expert's background, grievances filed against the witness by other inmates, and the history of any lawsuits filed against the expert by other inmates.

In the November 12, 2015, trial scheduling order, the Court directed that "if either party desires to include expert witnesses at trial, they must comply with the disclosure and timelines requirements set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(2)." (ECF No. 45, 4:26-27.) Rule 26(a)(2)(B) requires a party to disclose a complete statement of all opinions the witness will express and basis and reasons for them, the facts or date that will be used to summarize or support them, any exhibits that will be used to summarize or support them, the witness's

qualifications, including a list of all publications authored in the previous 10 years, a list of all other cases in the last 4 years that the witness testified as an expert, and a statement of the compensation to be paid.

Plaintiff's motion implies that Defendants have failed comply with the disclosure requirements of Rule 26. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants shall file a response to Plaintiff's motion with seven days of the date of service of this order.

Dated: **January 20, 2016**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE