

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 DANIEL GOMEZ,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 M. D. STAINER, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

Case No. 1:14-cv-00890 LJO DLB PC

ORDER DISMISSING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO AMEND COMPLAINT AND
DOCKET TO CORRECT NAME OF
DEFENDANTS
[ECF No. 12]

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR COURT RECORDS
[ECF No. 13]

17 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding in forma pauperis in this civil action pursuant to 42
18 U.S.C. § 1983.

19 On June 11, 2014, Plaintiff filed his complaint. On July 9, 2014, he filed a motion to
20 amend the complaint and docket to correct the names of certain Defendants. Plaintiff is advised
21 that the Court has reviewed the docket and determined that it reflects the correct names as stated
22 in his motion. Therefore, the motion is DENIED as moot.

23 On September 22, 2014, citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 34, Plaintiff filed a motion for production
24 of documents directed at the Court with respect to court records. Plaintiff is advised that a
25 request for production of documents can only be directed at a party or a third party, not the
26 Court. Further, Plaintiff is advised that the Court is required to screen complaints brought by
27 prisoners seeking relief against a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental
28

1 entity. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). Here, discovery is not open at this time since the complaint has
2 not yet been screened. Therefore, Plaintiff's request to open discovery is premature.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

4 1) Plaintiff's motion to amend the complaint is DENIED; and

5 2) Plaintiff's motion for production of documents is DENIED.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: January 21, 2015

/s/ Dennis L. Beck

9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28