

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

RICHARD GREENE,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:09-cv-0793 JFM (PC)

vs.

JAMES TILTON, et al.,

Defendants.

_____/ ORDER

Before the court is plaintiff’s third motion to compel, filed August 23, 2010. Plaintiff contends defendants have improperly provided blanket objections to virtually all of plaintiff’s discovery requests, including interrogatories, requests for admissions and requests for production of documents. Plaintiff claims he has not received responsive documents to his requests for production, and has not received a fair response to his requests for admissions or his interrogatories. Plaintiff also seeks sanctions against defense counsel for the latter’s allegedly uncooperative behavior during the course of discovery.

Counsel for defendants counters that he has timely filed his objections to plaintiff’s requests for production of documents and states that “Defendants served substantive good-faith objections to the subject discovery. Many, if not most, of the requests were ambiguous in their language, compound and overbroad. However, the objections stated in

1 Defendants' responses are clearly set forth and are self-explanatory. None of the objections
2 were taken or stated in bad faith or to avoid discovery. The requests were stated in unclear
3 language and were largely compound." (Opp'n at 2.)

4 Upon review of plaintiff's requests, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that

- 5 1. Plaintiff's August 23, 2010 motion to compel is denied;
- 6 2. Plaintiff's request for sanctions is denied.

7 DATED: October 5, 2010.

8
9 
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11 /014.gree0793.mtc(3)

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