

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

MATTHEW JAMES GRIFFIN,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
A. JOHNSON, et al.,  
  
Defendants.

Case No. 1:13-CV-01599-LJO-BAM (PC)  
  
ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS’  
MOTION TO MODIFY THE MAY 5,  
2016 ORDER LIFTING STAY OF  
DISCOVERY  
  
(ECF No. 80)  
  
**Responses to Pl.’s 1st Requests for  
Production Due: July 19, 2016**

Plaintiff Matthew James Griffin (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This action proceeds on Plaintiff’s first amended complaint for excessive force and for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment against Defendants Johnson, Gonzales, Valdez, Munoz, Sexton, Ross, Thor, Doe, Kul, Busch, Bell, and Smith.

On March 11, 2016, Defendants filed a motion modify the Court’s May 5, 2016 order lifting the stay of discovery in this matter. (ECF No. 80.) Plaintiff has not responded to this motion, but the Court finds no response necessary, and that Plaintiff will not be prejudiced by the consideration of Defendants’ motion. Local Rule 230(l).

1 The Court's May 5, 2016 order required Defendants to respond to Plaintiff's  
2 requests for production within thirty (30) days of the date of service of that order, and  
3 Defendants now seek an extension of that deadline until July 19, 2016. In support,  
4 Defendants have submitted a declaration of counsel indicating that counsel has begun  
5 working on the responses and requested documents to provide to Plaintiff. However,  
6 counsel requires additional time to receive the documents, review them, including for  
7 privilege and confidentiality, and fully-respond to Plaintiff's forty requests.

8 The Court finds good cause to grant the requested extension under the  
9 circumstances, where Defendant has shown diligence in responding to Plaintiff's  
10 discovery. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). Further, Plaintiff will not be prejudiced by a brief  
11 extension allowing Defendants the time necessary to provide complete responses to his  
12 requests for production.

13 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' motion to modify the  
14 Court's May 5, 2016 order, (ECF No. 80), is GRANTED. Defendants' responses to  
15 Plaintiff's first set of requests for production are due on or before July 19, 2016.

16  
17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: June 6, 2016

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe  
19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE