

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

LEONARD BROWN,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

 Defendant.

Case No. 1:13-cv-01122-LJO-SKO

ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF’S REPLY
TO DEFENDANT’S RESPONSE TO
PLAINTIFF’S OBJECTIONS TO
MAGISTRATE JUDGE’S FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

(Doc. 33)

Plaintiff Leonard Brown, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”) action pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552.6 on July 19, 2013. (Doc. 2.) On August 6 and 25, 2014, Plaintiff filed motions to compel discovery and to compel production of a Vaughn Index. (Docs. 15; 18.) Defendant Department of Justice (“DOJ”) filed oppositions to the motions to compel and filed a motion for summary judgment on September 8, 2014. (See Doc. 19.) Plaintiff then filed a cross-motion for summary judgment on September 26, 2014. (Doc. 20.) As the motions to compel discovery and to produce a Vaughn Index are directly related to the substantive issue of production of documents under the FOIA, they were continued and consolidated with the parties’ motions for summary judgment. (Doc. 26.)

On March 17, 2015, the Court recommended pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 304 that Defendant DOJ’s motion for summary judgment be granted and Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment be denied. (Doc. 27.) Plaintiff’s motions to compel discovery and the production of a Vaughn Index were concurrently denied as well. (Doc. 27.)

1 Plaintiff was notified that if he disagreed with the Court’s Findings and Recommendations,
2 he could file written objections with the Court and serve a copy on all parties within twenty-eight
3 (28) days of service of the recommendation. (See Doc. 27, p. 22-23.) On April 1, 2015, Plaintiff
4 filed his Objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations. (Doc. 30.) The
5 Court ordered the DOJ to file its response by April 13, 2015, in accordance with Local Rule
6 304(d). (Doc. 31.) The DOJ filed its Response to Plaintiff’s Objections to the Magistrate Judge’s
7 Findings and Recommendations (“Response”) on April 13, 2015. (Doc. 32.) Plaintiff was not
8 given leave to file any other document, pleading, or motion with the Court. (See Docs. 27, 29,
9 31.)

10 On April 24, 2015, apparently in response to the DOJ’s Response, Plaintiff filed his “Reply
11 to Defendant’s Response to Plaintiff’s Objections to Findings and Recommendations.” (Doc. 33.)

12 Plaintiff is not entitled to file a Reply to the DOJ’s Response under Local Rule 304, and
13 was not granted the Court’s leave to file a Reply to the DOJ’s Response. (See Local Rule 304
14 subds. (b), (d); Doc. 31.) In light of the foregoing and the Court’s recommendation on March 17,
15 2015, Plaintiff’s Reply to Defendant’s Response to Plaintiff’s Objections to the Magistrate Judge’s
16 Findings and Recommendations is ORDERED STRICKEN from the record.

17
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: April 27, 2015

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28