1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 7 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 8 9 FRANCISCO VEGA, JR., Case No. 1:22-cv-00471-JLT-EPG (PC) 10 Plaintiff, ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE FOR CLARIFICATION 11 v. (ECF No. 45) 12 M. SOTO, et al., 13 Defendants. 14 15 Plaintiff Francisco Vega, Jr., is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights 16 action. The Court entered a scheduling order on April 26, 2023, among other things, limiting the 17 parties to "serve on any other party no more than 15 interrogatories." (ECF No. 42, p. 3). Plaintiff 18 has filed a request for clarification of the limit on interrogatories. (ECF No. 45). Specifically, 19 Plaintiff states that it appears that the Court made a mistake because Federal Rule of Civil 20 Procedure 33(a) provides for a limit of 25 written interrogatories, not 15. However, he also notes 21 that this default applies "[u]nless otherwise . . . ordered by the court." He asks whether the Court 22 intended to exercise its power to limit the number of interrogatories from 25 to 15. 23 Plaintiff is advised that the Court's order does limit the number of default interrogatories 24 from 25 to 15 in this case. However, as noted in the order, "[i]f a party wishes to serve additional 25 discovery requests, that party may file a motion for additional discovery requests with the Court, 26 explaining why additional discovery requests are necessary." 27 /// /// 28

Based on the above, IT IS ORDERED as follows: 1. Plaintiff's request for clarification (ECF No. 45). is granted to the extent that the Court confirms that it is exercising its power to reduce the default number of written interrogatories from 25 to 15 in this case. 2. If Plaintiff wishes to serve additional interrogatories, he may file a motion, explaining why additional interrogatories are needed. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: May 22, 2023