

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

IRWIN DOUGLAS,
Plaintiff,
vs.
SACRAMENTO COUNTY, et al.,
Defendants.

No. CIV 09-1038 FCD EFB PS

ORDER

This action is before the undersigned pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rule 302(c)(21). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). On January 28, plaintiff filed his initial disclosures in this case pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1), Dckt. No. 28; on April 5, 2010, defendants filed a request for admissions from plaintiff, Dckt. No. 31; and on April 5, 2010, plaintiff filed supplemental disclosures pursuant to Rule 26(a)(1), Dckt. No. 32.

Initial disclosures and discovery requests and responses “shall not be filed unless and until there is a proceeding in which the [discovery] or proof of service is at issue. When required in a proceeding, only that part of the [discovery request and response] that is in issue shall be filed.” E.D. Cal. L.R. 250.2-250.4; Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1). Accordingly, docket numbers 28, 31, and 32 are stricken and the Clerk of the Court shall make a notation on the docket to that effect.

1111

1 Additionally, on March 15, 2010, defendants filed their expert disclosure in accordance
2 with the November 10, 2009 status (pretrial scheduling) order and the January 22, 2010
3 amendment thereto. Dckt. No. 29. On March 30, 2010, plaintiff filed objections to defendants'
4 expert designation, challenging the expert's qualifications and the substance of his testimony.
5 Because those objections are premature, they will be disregarded at this time.

6 DATED: April 8, 2010.

7 
8 EDMUND F. BRENNAN
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26