

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

SEAN BAPTISTE NEAL,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-08-0313 GEB KJM P

vs.

ROSEANNE CAMPBELL, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____/

Plaintiff is a California prisoner proceeding pro se with an action for violation of civil rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 20, 2009, plaintiff filed a motion asking that the court compel defendants to provide further responses to his request for interrogatories. In his complaint, plaintiff alleges defendants retaliated against him for exercise of his religious beliefs.

The court has reviewed plaintiff’s motion and finds that it is vague. Plaintiff’s concerns with defendants’ responses are stated so broadly that the court cannot determine whether defendants should be required to respond further. For example, plaintiff at one point states, “Defendant White feigned ignorance to three of seven interrogatories.” The court has also reviewed some of defendants’ responses and finds they are, at times, evasive. For example, plaintiff asks defendants if there is any evidence indicating he was involved in gang activity and defendants object on grounds that the phrase “gang activity” is vague without making any

1 attempt to consider the context of plaintiff's question and discern a meaning of a phrase that, on
2 its face, does not seem difficult to understand.

3 Good cause appearing, the court will deny plaintiff's motion to compel with leave
4 to submit an amended motion within thirty days. In the amended motion, plaintiff must indicate
5 specific concerns with specific responses to plaintiff's interrogatories, and not simply say that all
6 the responses are "vague" or evasive." To the extent plaintiff does not assert specific concerns,
7 the court will not address plaintiff's motion.

8 Plaintiff also asks for an extension of time to conduct discovery. Except to the
9 extent described above, plaintiff's request is denied as he has not shown good cause to extend
10 discovery beyond its closure on February 13, 2009.

11 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

12 1. Plaintiff's January 20, 2009 motion to compel (#27) is denied without
13 prejudice to plaintiff filing an amended motion to compel within thirty days. The amended
14 motion shall conform to the requirements identified above.

15 2. Plaintiff's February 9, 2009 (#30) request for an extension of time to conduct
16 discovery (#30), except to the extent described above, is denied.

17 DATED: April 14, 2009.

18 
19 _____
20 U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

21 1
22 neal313.mtc
23
24
25
26