

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TRAVIS GEORGE MISKAM,	)	CIVIL NO. 2:08-02229 JMS
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
	)	DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFF’S
vs.	)	MOTION FOR A COURT ORDER TO
	)	COMPEL A DISCOVERY
S. MCALLISTER, et al.,	)	RESPONSE
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFF’S  
MOTION FOR A COURT ORDER TO COMPEL A DISCOVERY  
RESPONSE**

On August 30, 2010, pro se prisoner Travis George Miskam (“Plaintiff”) filed a document titled “Motion for a Court Order to Compel a Discovery Response” (“Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel”). Plaintiff asserts that he served Defendants with a Request for Production of Documents on May 4, 2010, and a First Set of Interrogatories on May 25, 2010. The court ordered Defendants to file an Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel by October 5, 2010. Defendants failed to file any Opposition.

The court GRANTS Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel to the extent it seeks a response from Defendants on Plaintiff’s discovery requests. Defendants shall respond to Plaintiff’s discovery requests by October 29, 2010. Failure to

respond to Plaintiff's discovery requests will result in sanctions. The court DENIES Plaintiff's Motion to Compel, however, to the extent it seeks substantive sanctions against Defendants. Defendants are warned that any further failure to comply with their discovery obligations will result in sanctions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawaii, October 12, 2010.



/s/ J. Michael Seabright  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J. Michael Seabright  
United States District Judge

*Miskam v. McAllister*, Civ. No. 2:08-02229 JMS, Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Plaintiff's Motion for a Court Order to Compel a Discovery Response