

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

11 **BARON BOWER,**

12 **Plaintiff,**

13 **v.**

14 **FOSTER FARMS,**

15 **Defendant.**

Case No. 1:15-cv-00079-GEB-SAB

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR IN CAMERA REVIEW AND
GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR
AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO PAY THE
FILING FEE

(ECF No. 18)

PAYMENT DUE APRIL 1, 2015

17
18 Plaintiff Baron Bower ("Plaintiff"), appearing pro se in this action, filed the complaint in
19 this action on January 16, 2015. (ECF No. 1.) The Court recommended on March 11, 2015, that
20 Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis be denied and he is to pay the filing fee or
21 file objections within fourteen days. On March 19, 2015, the Court issued findings and
22 recommendations that Defendant's motion to dismiss be granted without leave to amend. On
23 this same date, Plaintiff filed a motion to review the unredacted settlement agreement and
24 requested that he be granted until April 1, 2015 to pay the filing fee in this action.

25 Initially, the Court shall grant Plaintiff's request to have an extension to pay the filing fee
26 in this action.

27 Plaintiff also seeks in camera review of the unredacted settlement agreement that was
28 filed with Defendant's motion to dismiss "to enable [him] to ascertain value." (ECF No. 18 at

1 1.) To the extent that Plaintiff is seeking to examine the document without redaction, “in camera
2 review means that the judge may, in private, without others present,” read records which are in
3 dispute. 1 Fed. Info. Discl. § 8:26. Documents that are not subject to privilege may be obtained
4 by a plaintiff by means of a proper discovery request. Plaintiff’s request to review the settlement
5 in camera is denied.

6 To the extent that Plaintiff requests the Court to conduct an in camera review of the
7 settlement agreement as proffered by Defendant in the motion to dismiss, the Court took judicial
8 notice of the unredacted settlement agreement which he filed in Bower v. Foster Farms Dairy,
9 1:07-cv-0917-LJO-SMS. (Findings and Recommendations Recommending Granting
10 Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss 4 n.2, ECF No. 17.) The Court did not find it necessary to
11 review the settlement agreement in camera to decide the motion to dismiss.

12 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 13 1. Plaintiff’s request to review the settlement request in camera is DENIED;
- 14 2. Plaintiff’s request for an extension of time to April 1, 2015 to pay the filing fee is
15 GRANTED; and
- 16 3. Plaintiff is advised that failure to pay the filing fee or file objections in
17 compliance with this order and the March 11, 2015 findings and recommendation
18 will result in this action being dismissed.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: March 23, 2015

21 
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
23
24
25
26
27
28