1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10	CHARLES CHATMAN,				
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-03-2415 RRB KJM P				
12	VS.				
13	T. FELKER, et al.,				
14	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>				
15	/				
16	Plaintiff is a state prison inmate proceeding pro se with a civil rights action under				
17	42 U.S.C. §1982. On January 2, 2008, he filed a motion for an extension of time in which to				
18	conduct discovery. He contends that he is corresponding with defendants' counsel concerning				
19	defendants' responses to discovery, which plaintiff considers inadequate. He adds that he				
20	wishes to pursue additional requests for admissions.				
21	Plaintiff has not explained, however, why he did not serve his requests for				
22	admissions during the additional time granted by the court in response to plaintiff's initial				
23	motion for additional time to conduct discovery. Moreover, although plaintiff is apparently				
24	attempting to confer with defendants about discovery issues, this does not excuse his failure to				
25	proceed with discovery: the court's June 26, 2007 discovery order specifically exempted this				
26	/////				
	1				

case from the meet and confer provisions of the local rules. L.R. 37-251. Plaintiff will be given
 additional time, however, in which to file any motions to compel discovery.

Finally, plaintiff alleges his copy of the complaint was seized by two prison
guards and asks the court to provide a copy of the complaint without requiring that he pay the
copying fees. A litigant's in forma pauperis status does not extend to exempt him from the
incidental expenses of litigation. See, e.g. Tedder v. Odel, 890 F.2d 210, 211 (9th Cir. 1989).
Nevertheless, because the litigation may be delayed if plaintiff is denied access to his complaint,
the court will direct the clerk to provide plaintiff with a copy.

9

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

Plaintiff's request for an extension of time in which to conduct discovery
 (docket no. 92) is denied;

Plaintiff is given until February 8, 2008 in which to file any motions to compel
 discovery; and

3. Plaintiff's request for a copy of his complaint (docket no. 92) is granted and
the Clerk of the Court is directed to send plaintiff a copy of his amended complaint, filed
December 27, 2004.

17 DATED: January 31, 2008.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

chat2515.eot+

V	A	Mir	el.	
U.S. N	IAGIST	RATE JI	UDGE	

2