

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-06-2035 FCD KJM P

vs.

D. K. SISTO, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____/

Plaintiff has filed a motion asking the court to compel defendant Rowlett to provide further responses to requests for discovery. On January 8, 2009, the court extended the date previously set for the close of discovery to January 30, 2009. Plaintiff's motion to compel was filed on March 11, 2009; plaintiff fails to provide good cause for filing his motion nearly six weeks after the discovery cut off date. Moreover, the point raised by defendant Rowlett in her opposition to plaintiff's motion -- that the motion does not identify with particularity the discovery it seeks to compel, precluding the granting of meaningful relief -- is well-taken.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to compel (#65) is denied. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b).

DATED: April 10, 2009.



U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

1 john2035.mtc