

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

MARQUETTE HANDY,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-08-2765 LKK DAD P

vs.

DEBRINA WILLIAMS, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

Plaintiff has filed a document entitled “reply to defendant William’s first set of interrogatories.” Plaintiff is informed that court permission is not necessary for discovery requests and that neither discovery requests served on an opposing party nor that party’s responses should be filed until such time as a party becomes dissatisfied with a response and seeks relief from the court pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Discovery requests between the parties shall not be filed with the court unless, and until, they are at issue.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff’s June 19, 2009 reply to defendant William’s first set of interrogatories (Doc. No. 17) will be placed in the court file and disregarded. Plaintiff is cautioned that further filing of discovery requests or responses,

////

////

1 except as required by rule of court, may result in an order of sanctions, including, but not limited
2 to, a recommendation that this action be dismissed.

3 DATED: July 1, 2009.

4
5 
6 _____
7 DALE A. DROZD
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7 DAD:9:mp
8 hand2765.411

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26