

1 2014), he must nonetheless demonstrate good cause. *See* Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(b)(1); *Cantu v. Garcia*,
2 2013 WL 101667 (E.D. Cal. 2013); *Eichler v. Tilton*, 2010 WL 457334, at *1 (E.D. Cal. 2010).

3 Here, Plaintiff served his first set of twenty-seven interrogatories on February 16, 2016.
4 Wheeler Decl. ¶ 2. Defendant responded in full on April 1, 2016. Wheeler Decl. ¶ 3. On April
5 14, 2016, Plaintiff propounded his second set of interrogatories, which included an additional
6 twenty-four interrogatories. Wheeler Decl. ¶ 5. On May 18, 2016, Defendant objected to the
7 interrogatories because Plaintiff did not first obtain leave of Court to propound the additional
8 interrogatories. Wheeler Decl. ¶ 6.

9 Plaintiff did not know of the limitations in Rule 33 when he served his first set of
10 interrogatories. He contends that the additional interrogatories are necessary to show that
11 Defendant intentionally placed his life in danger when he told Plaintiff that he had to stab his
12 cellie to earn single-cell status. Specifically, Plaintiff argues that the additional interrogatories
13 will show that Defendant went out of his way to place Inmate Walker in his cell, which created a
14 hostile environment that could have resulted in injury.

15 Defendant correctly notes that Plaintiff has failed to explain why the first twenty-seven
16 interrogatories were insufficient. However, given that Plaintiff is an incarcerated prisoner
17 proceeding pro se, this does not end the inquiry. Discovery must be limited if it is unreasonably
18 cumulative or duplicative, Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(b)(2) (C)(i), but that determination must be viewed
19 through the lens of Plaintiff's pro se status.

20 The Court has reviewed both the first and second sets of interrogatories and finds that
21 there is no evidence that Plaintiff is abusing the discovery process, or that the additional
22 discovery is unreasonably cumulative or duplicative. Many of interrogatories in the first set were
23 rather general, and many required simple responses. The second set, however, asks specific
24 questions about the events at issue, including questions directed at discovering why Defendant
25 took the actions of which Plaintiff complains. Even though the second set is more issue-specific,
26 the questions are not overly complex.

27 ///

28 ///

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

Defendant suggests that this case is relatively simple, and that twenty-seven questions should be enough. Again, however, Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, and without formal legal training, and Defendant will not be overly burdened in responding to the additional questions.

Plaintiff's motion is therefore GRANTED. Defendant SHALL respond to the second set of interrogatories within thirty (30) days of the date of service of this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 6, 2016

/s/ Dennis L. Beck
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE