

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**

JEREMY JONES,	)	Case No. 1:14-cv-02045-DAD-SAB (PC)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	ORDER OVERRULING PLAINTIFF'S
v.	)	OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO
	)	MODIFY THE DISCOVERY AND SCHEDULING
JIMENEZ, et al.,	)	ORDER
	)	
Defendants.	)	[ECF No. 91]
	)	
	)	
	)	

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

On February 14, 2018, Plaintiff filed an opposition to Defendants' motion to modify the scheduling order. (ECF No. 91.)

On January 30, 2018, Defendants filed a motion to extend the deadline the discovery deadline to allow Plaintiff to serve discovery responses and to take Plaintiff's deposition. (ECF No. 89.) On February 1, 2018, the Court granted Defendants' motion based on the finding of good cause. (ECF No. 90.) The Court construes Plaintiff's opposition as an objection to the Court's February 1, 2018 order.

///  
///

1 In Defendants' January 30, 2018 motion, defense counsel declared that Plaintiff has been  
2 unable to produce certain discovery documents and it was necessary to continue Plaintiff's deposition  
3 previously scheduled for January 18, 2018. Defendants requested that the Court continue the  
4 discovery deadline for the limited purpose of allowing Plaintiff time to serve complete discovery  
5 responses which are relevant to the claims and defenses and to allow them to complete Plaintiff's  
6 deposition.

7 Plaintiff contends this case is a "waste" of time and requests that the Court set a settlement  
8 conference and force the Defendants to settle the case. Defense counsel's declaration was sufficient to  
9 support a finding of good cause to warrant an extension of the discovery, and Plaintiff's objections  
10 thereto are overruled. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b). Furthermore, Plaintiff is advised that the Court  
11 cannot "force" the Defendants to settle the case, and on September 18, 2017, a settlement conference  
12 was held but the case did not settle. Accordingly, Plaintiff's objections to the Court's February 1,  
13 2018 order are overruled.

14  
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: February 15, 2018



UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE