

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

9 SILUS M. VALSON,
10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 MATTHEW CATE and MARTIN BITER,
13 Defendants.
14

Case No. 1:14-cv-01420-DAD-EPG (PC)

ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR
ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF'S
INSTITUTION OF CONFINEMENT TO
ALLOW PLAINTIFF TO MAKE COPIES
OF SCHEDULING CONFERENCE
STATEMENT

(ECF NO. 31)

15
16 Silus Valson ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in
17 this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

18 On February 26, 2018, Plaintiff filed a request for an order directing his institution of
19 confinement to allow him to make copies of his scheduling conference statement ("the
20 Request"). Plaintiff states that "Senior Law Librarian Ms. . . . Lirone's denial was based on the
21 document contained published documentation from MedlinePlus of the National Institute of
22 Health/U.S. National Library of Medicine." (ECF No. 31, at p. 2)

23 As discussed on the record at the hearing on March 5, 2018, the documents that Plaintiff
24 describes are not needed for his scheduling conference statement. The Court did not require
25 Plaintiff to submit any evidence for the scheduling conference. Thus, the Court denies
26 Plaintiff's request for an order related to the scheduling conference statement.

27 However, the Court notes that Plaintiff should be allowed to make copies of documents
28 that he is using to support his case, including documents Plaintiff identified in the Request (the

1 documents from the National Institutes of Health/U.S. National Library of Medicine that
2 Plaintiff obtained from his Freedom of Information Act request to the Department of Health
3 and Human Services), because Plaintiff has an obligation to provide documents that he may use
4 to support his claims in this case to Defendants. See, e.g., Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 & 34.

5 Thus, Plaintiff's institution should allow him to make copies of documents necessary
6 for his case. He has a legal obligation to share those documents with Defendants.

7 If Plaintiff's institution of confinement does not allow Plaintiff to make copies of
8 documents that are necessary for use in this case, Plaintiff may file a motion with the Court,
9 and the Court may issue an order requiring Plaintiff's institution of confinement to allow
10 Plaintiff to make copies.

11 Accordingly, based on the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED that the Request is DENIED
12 without prejudice.

13
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: March 6, 2018

16 /s/ Eric P. Grogan
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28