

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**

CURTIS BOYD,	)	Case No.: 1:13-01966-SAB (PC)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF’S RESPONSE
v.	)	TO DEFENDATS’ REQUEST TO EXTEND TIME
	)	TO FILE A RESPONSIVE PLEADING AND
C. ETCHEBEHERE, et al.,	)	NOTICE RELATING TO DISCOVERY
	)	REQUESTS
Defendants.	)	
	)	[ECF No. 13]
	)	

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

On September 15, 2014, Plaintiff filed a response to Defendants’ request to extend the time to file a response pleading which was granted by the Court on August 11, 2014. (ECF Nos. 10, 11.)

Plaintiff represents that he has no objection to Defendants’ request to extend the time to file a responsive pleading but requests the Court to take notice of certain discovery documents he has served on Defendants.

Plaintiff is advised, as set forth in the Court’s September 18, 2014, discovery and scheduling order, discovery requests shall be served by the parties pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 and Local Rule 135. Discovery requests and responses shall not be filed with the Court unless required by Local Rules 250.2, 250.3 and 250.4. (ECF No. 14, 1:19-21.) In addition, responses to written discovery requests are due forty-five days after the request is first served. (Id. at 1:22-24.)

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

Accordingly, in light of the Court's September 18, 2014, discovery and scheduling order, Plaintiff's present motion is unnecessary and is DENIED on such basis.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 19, 2014

  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE