1 2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 9 JARED M. VILLERY, Case No. 1:15-cv-00987-DAD-BAM (PC) 10 11 Plaintiff, ORDER FOLLOWING SECOND INFORMAL TELEPHONIC DISCOVERY CONFERENCE, 12 HELD ON JANUARY 30, 2018 v. 13 JEFFREY BEARD, et al., [ECF Nos. 52, 59] 14 Defendants. 15 16 Plaintiff Jared M. Villery is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this 17 civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. 18 19 On January 30, 2017, the Court held a second informal telephonic discovery conference. Plaintiff appeared telephonically on his own behalf, and Sarah Margaret Gold Brattin appeared on 20 behalf of Defendants. 21 22 For the reasons discussed at the conference, it is HEREBY ORDERED as follows: 23 Plaintiff may file a motion for reconsideration of the Court's July 5, 2017 screening order on the limited issue of the scope of the policy claim against Defendants Beard and Kernan. 25 Plaintiff must deliver his motion to prison authorities for mailing to the Clerk of the Court no later 26 than **February 9, 2018**. Defendants may file a response on or before **February 23, 2018**. No reply will be permitted, and the motion will be deemed submitted after the time for Defendants' response 27 has passed. Local Rule 230(1); 28

1	2.
2	to the Req
3	(19) additi
4	Defendant
5	Defendant
6	admission
7	claim, disc
8	3.
9	these disco
10	disputes. A
11	motion to
12	review eac
13	motion, an
14	
15	IT IS SO
16	Dated:
17	Dutea.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
2	

2. Defendants Acosta, Kendall, Grimmig, Woodard, Guerrero, and Jones shall respond to the Requests for Admission listed in Plaintiff's January 16, 2018 letter, including the nineteen (19) additional requests to Defendant Grimmig described in the letter, by **March 16, 2018**. Defendants are not precluded from raising specific objections to the requests, where appropriate. Defendants Beard and Kernan are granted a STAY on responding to Plaintiff's requests for admission until after a determination on Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration regarding the policy claim, discussed above;

3. The Court expects the parties to take into consideration the guidance given during these discovery conferences and expects them to continue to meet and confer in good faith on any disputes. As noted during the conference, if the parties bring any motion for a protective order or a motion to compel regarding numerous discovery requests, the Court does not have the resources to review each individual request. Requests at issue must be described by categories in any such motion, and providing samples is acceptable.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 31, 2018

/s/ Barlara A. McAuliffe
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE