

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 DANIEL HARPER,

11 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-07-2148 JAM KJM P

12 vs.

13 COSTA, et al.,

14 Defendants.

ORDER

15 \_\_\_\_\_/  
16 Plaintiff is a state prison inmate proceeding pro se with a civil rights action under  
17 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On November 24, 2008, this court granted defendants' motion for an  
18 extension of time in which to respond to plaintiff's discovery requests and in essence stayed  
19 discovery until after the resolution of the pending motion to dismiss (docket no. 39). The court  
20 also warned plaintiff not to file his discovery requests with the court (docket no. 38).

21 Defendants have now filed a second request for an extension of time in which to  
22 respond to plaintiff's latest requests for discovery (docket no. 46). Counsel explains, correctly,  
23 that plaintiff has filed two additional sets of requests for production of documents despite the  
24 court's order forbidding him to do so. Plaintiff also has filed motions for an extension of time in  
25 which to conduct discovery (docket nos. 42 & 43) and two requests for permission to conduct  
26 discovery before the discovery conference (Docket Nos. 40 & 41). Given the recent findings and

1 recommendations, now pending before the district judge, all discovery of any kind will be stayed.  
2 The discovery plaintiff has filed with the court will be disregarded.

3 Finally, plaintiff has filed a bizarre motion for a protective order, seeking relief  
4 from “numerous depositions scheduled . . . by Daniel Harper” because “the examination at these  
5 depositions . . . is intended solely to annoy, embarrass and oppress Daniel Harper and its agents  
6 and employees” (docket No. 44 at 1). This motion, which the court finds incomprehensible, will  
7 be denied.

8 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

9 1. Defendants’ motion for an extension of time in which to respond to plaintiff’s  
10 discovery requests (docket no. 46) is granted in that all discovery is stayed until the district judge  
11 rules on the pending findings and recommendations; if they are not adopted, a discovery schedule  
12 will issue;

13 2. Plaintiff’s motions for extensions of time in which to conduct discovery  
14 (docket nos. 42 & 43) are denied without prejudice;

15 3. Plaintiff’s motions to conduct discovery before the discovery conference  
16 (docket nos. 40 & 41) are denied; and

17 4. Plaintiff’s motion for a protective order (docket no. 44) is denied.

18 DATED: February 11, 2009.

19  
20   
21 U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
22  
23