1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 MIC 12 13 14 G G

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL A. WASHINGTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

G. GARCIA, et al.,

Defendants.

(Case No.: 1:15-cv-01805-LJO-SAB (PC)

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' REQUEST FOR RELIEF FROM ORDER REQUIRING INITIAL DISCLOSURES AND VACATING DISCOVERY AND SCHEDULING ORDER
(ISSUED ON AUGUST 23, 2016)

[Doc. Nos. 15, 16, 28]

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

Currently before the Court is Defendants' request for relief from the order requiring initial disclosures, filed October 20, 2016. Because the Court can resolve the instant motion without opposition, the Court will not wait for the opposition deadline to expire prior to issuance of a ruling on the instant motion. Local Rule 230(1).

On August 23, 2016, the previously-assigned magistrate judge issued a discovery and scheduling order, directing the parties to provide initial disclosures under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26. (ECF No. 16.) After an extension of the initial deadline, the current deadline for initial disclosure is November 7, 2016. (ECF No. 21.)

Because the deadline for initial disclosures has not yet expired and it is not standard practice for the undersigned to issue initial disclosures in these types of cases, the Court will vacate the

1	discovery and scheduling order previously issued and issue a new discovery order by separate order.
2	Thus, the Court need not and will not address the merits of Defendants' motion in this instance.
3	Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED that the discovery and scheduling order issued on August 23,
4	2016 (ECF No. 16), is VACATED, and the Court will issue a new discovery and scheduling order by
5	separate order.
6	
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.
8	Dated: October 25, 2016
9	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	