## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THOMAS JOHN HEILMAN,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:08-cv-2788 KJM EFB P

VS.

13 VOJKULFKA, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On July 10, 2012, the court ordered plaintiff to file a pretrial statement within 30 days. Dckt. No. 96. In response, plaintiff filed a motion to compel and requested an extension of time to file a pretrial statement. Dckt. Nos. 97, 99. As stated below, the court denies plaintiff's motion to compel but grants plaintiff one 30-day extension of time to file a pretrial statement.

In his motion to compel, plaintiff concedes that the discover deadline "has long passed." *See* Dckt. No. 97. *See also* Jan. 20, 2010 Discovery & Scheduling Order, Dckt. No. 18 (requiring that motions to compel be filed by April 16, 2010); Dckt. No. 38 (extending discovery deadline to September 26, 2010, for a limited purpose). Nevertheless, plaintiff requests an order

mandating that the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation supplement the

discovery responses that they provided to plaintiff nearly two years ago, on October 29, 2010.

Dckt. No. 97 at 2. According to plaintiff, he previously moved to compel these responses but the issue "was never properly addressed by the court." *Id.* at 3. However, the case file reflects that on February 17, 2011, the court denied plaintiff's motion to compel the responses he now seeks. *See* Dckt. No. 74 (granting in part and denying in part plaintiff's motion to compel (Dckt. No. 67)). Plaintiff's motion, whether construed as a motion to compel or a motion for reconsideration of the February 17, 2011 order, is denied as untimely. *See* E.D. Cal., Local Rule 303(b) ("Rulings by Magistrate Judges . . . shall be final if no reconsideration thereof is sought from the Court within fourteen (14) days . . . .").

Plaintiff also requests an extension of time to file and serve a pretrial statement. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b). Plaintiff claims to be without copies of certain documents that he needs in order

R. Civ. P. 6(b). Plaintiff claims to be without copies of certain documents that he needs in order to prepare his pretrial statement. Plaintiff is hereby informed that he need not provide copies of his exhibits with his pretrial statement. Rather, he need only provide a list of his exhibits, just as he has done in his request for an extension of time. The court is not a repository for plaintiff's evidence and will not scour the docket in search of plaintiff's missing documents. If properly identified by plaintiff, the Clerk's Office will provide copies of documents for \$0.50 per page.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to compel (Dckt. No. 97) is denied and plaintiff's request for an extension of time (Dckt. No. 99) is granted, in that plaintiff shall have a one time extension of 30 days from the date of this order, to file and serve a pretrial statement.

DATED: August 3, 2012.

EDMUND F. BRENNAN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE