28

1 WILLIAMS & ASSOCIATES 1250 Sutterville Road, Ste. 290 Sacramento, CA 95822 (916) 456-1122 3 (916) 737-1126 (fax) Kathleen J. Williams, CSB #127021 4 LaKeysia R. Beene, CSB #265078 5 Attorneys for defendants JAMES, ROCHE and HUNSAKER 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 DANIEL H. GOVIND. CASE NO: 2:08-CV-01183-ODW Consolidated with Case No: 11 Plaintiff, 2:06-CV-02467 VS. **ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS** 12 MR. FELKER, MR. D.L. RUNNELS, MR. JAMES, ROCHE AND HUNSAKER'S M. McDONALD, 13 MOTION TO DISMISS 14 Defendants. 15 Defendants JAMES, ROCHE and HUNSAKER filed a motion to dismiss pursuant to 16 17 Rule 41(b), Rule 37(d)(1)(A) and Rule 37(b)(2)(A)(v) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Eastern District Local Rule 110. The Court, having considered all the papers submitted, 18 19 hereby rules as follows: Plaintiff failed to comply with Court Orders and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 20 (1) 21 by refusing to participate at his deposition after being warned that his refusal to comply would 22 result in dismissal of the case; therefore, the case is dismissed pursuant to FRCP 41(b), FRCP 23 37(b)(2)(A)(v), and Local Rule 110; 24 (2) The Court and defense counsel warned plaintiff of the consequences of failure to 25 submit to defendants' discovery requests. However, after being properly served with 26 interrogatories under Rule 33, requests for production under Rule 34, and request for admission 27 under Rule 36, plaintiff failed to serve his answers, objections, or written responses. Based on

Govind v Felker [2:08-cv-01183] Proposed Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss

Page 1

1	plaintiff's failure to participate in discovery, defendants are prejudiced in attempting to defend
2	against plaintiff's claims because they are unable to ascertain precisely what evidence plaintiff
3	intends to offer at trial and what conduct on their part will be called upon to defend at trial.
4	Because of plaintiff's refusal to comply with the Court's Orders requiring him to participate in
5	discovery, dismissal is also appropriate pursuant to FRCP 37(d)(1)(A), FRCP 37(b)(2)(A)(v),
6	and FRCP 41(b). In addition, plaintiff's failure to provide a timely response to the requests for
7	admission has resulted in the admission of those requests which admissions dispense with any
8	potential claim by plaintiff against defendants JAMES, ROCHE and HUNSAKER.
9	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendants JAMES, ROCHE and HUNSAKER Motion
10	to Dismiss is granted. JAMES, ROCHE and HUNSAKER are dismissed from this lawsuit with
11	prejudice and judgment on their behalf is hereby entered.
12	IT IS SO ORDERED.
13	With Whigh
14	Dated: June 24, 2011 Hon. Judge Otis D. Wright
15	Hon. Judge Ous D. Wright
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28

1	PROOF OF SERVICE
2	Case: Govind v Felker, et al. Court: USDC, Eastern District of California Case No: 2:08-cv-01183-ODW
4 5	I am a citizen of the United States, employed in the City and County of Sacramento. My business address is 1250 Sutterville Road, Suite 290, Sacramento, California 95822. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the above-entitled action.
6 7	I am familiar with WILLIAMS & ASSOCIATES' practice whereby the mail is sealed, given the appropriate postage and placed in a designated mail collection area. Each day's mail is collected and deposited in a U.S. mailbox after the close of each day's business.
8	I certify that on June 23, 2011, pursuant to F.R.C.P. 5(b), I deposited in the United States mail, postage prepaid, a true copy of the document entitled:
10	PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS JAMES, ROCHE AND HUNSAKER'S MOTION TO DISMISS
11	
12	and addressed as follows:
13	LEGAL DOCUMENTS ENCLOSED Daniel H. Govind, CDC# K17945
1415	Unit #2 Dorm-2-48L California Correctional Institution P.O. Box 608 Tehachapi, CA 93581
1617	I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this Court at whose direction this service was made.
18	DATED: June 23, 2011
19	/s/ Susan J. Olsson
20	SUSAN J. OLSSON
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	Govind v Felker [2:08-cv-01183] Proposed Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Page 3