

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

JARED M. VILLERY,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

JEFFREY BEARD, et al.,

 Defendants.

Case No. 1:15-cv-00987-DAD-BAM (PC)

ORDER GRANTING IN PART DEFENDANT
KERNAN AND BEARD’S REQUEST FOR AN
EXTENSION OF TIME TO RESPOND TO
DISCOVERY

[ECF No. 67]

Plaintiff Jared M. Villery is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Currently before the Court is Defendants Kernan and Beard’s request for an extension of time to respond to discovery, filed on February 28, 2018 (ECF No. 67). Although Plaintiff has not filed a response, the Court finds no response necessary, and that Plaintiff will not be prejudiced by the Court’s consideration of the motion. It is therefore deemed submitted. Local Rule 230(1).

Defendants Kernan and Beard note that Plaintiff has filed a motion for reconsideration, which affects the scope of the policy claim against them. They request a thirty-day extension of time to respond to Plaintiff’s Request for Production of Documents, Set One, and Interrogatories, Set One, until the motion for reconsideration is ruled upon. Defendants submitted a letter from Plaintiff in which he argues that most of the discovery requests are not impacted by his motion for reconsideration. Plaintiff also argues that a fourteen-day extension is sufficient.

The Court finds good cause is shown for an extension of time here, as Defendants Kernan and Beard must be apprised of the scope of the policy claim against them in this case to properly

1 provide full and complete discovery responses. As noted above, the Court has now ruled on
2 Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration. (ECF No. 70.) As discussed in that order, the Court affirmed
3 that the policy claim in this case is limited to a policy to pressure mental health staff not to
4 recommend single cell housing due to overcrowding.

5 Given that the necessary ruling has been made, and that the scope of the policy claim has
6 been affirmed to be relatively narrow, the Court finds that twenty (20) days is a sufficient extension
7 of time under the circumstances. Therefore, Defendants Kernan and Beards responses shall be
8 served in twenty (20) days from the date of this order.

9 Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant Kernan and Beards' request for an
10 extension of time, filed on February 28, 2018 (ECF No. 67) is granted, in part. Defendants Kernan
11 and Beard shall serve responses to Plaintiff's Request for Production of Documents, Set One, and
12 Interrogatories, Set One, within twenty (20) days of the date of service of this order.

13
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: March 16, 2018

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE