

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

CASEY WATKINS,
Plaintiff,
v.
CHAD GREENWOOD, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:16-cv-00850-LJO-SAB
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
TO AMEND THE SCHEDULING ORDER
(ECF Nos. 33, 37)

Plaintiff Casey Watkins is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On July 5, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting that the scheduling order be extended. (ECF No. 33.) On July 13, 2017, Defendant Sims filed an opposition to Plaintiff’s motion to amend the scheduling order. (ECF No. 37.)

Plaintiff seeks to amend the discovery and scheduling order so that he can obtain counsel in this action. Plaintiff also notes that he is unable to make copies of any documents that need to be sent to Defendants and their counsel because California Men’s Colony does not consider personal correspondence to attorneys and public officials to be legal court rules material for the purposes of the legal photocopying service. Pursuant to the scheduling order, the deadline to amend the complaint is September 15, 2017, and discovery does not close until November 15, 2017. The Court finds Plaintiff has not demonstrated good cause to amend the scheduling order at this time. Plaintiff filed this action on June 20, 2016, and the scheduling order issued on

1 March 15, 2017. Plaintiff has had approximately a year since this action was filed and four
2 months since the scheduling order issued to obtain representation had he desired to do so. If
3 Plaintiff obtains representation prior to the expiration of the deadlines in the scheduling order,
4 counsel can seek to amend the scheduling order at that time. However, Plaintiff is advised that
5 he is required to comply with the current scheduling order; and the Court will not find good
6 cause to extend any deadlines due to Plaintiff's inaction in prosecuting this matter. In other
7 words, Plaintiff is required to conduct discovery and move this matter forward, even if he is
8 proceeding pro se.

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to amend the scheduling
10 order (ECF No. 33) is DENIED.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: August 7, 2017

13 
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE