

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 IRWIN DOUGLAS,

No. CIV 09-1038 FCD EFB PS

11 Plaintiff,

12 vs.

13 SACRAMENTO COUNTY, et al.,

ORDER

14 Defendants.
_____ /

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

20 Initial disclosures and discovery requests and responses “shall not be filed unless and
21 until there is a proceeding in which the [discovery] or proof of service is at issue. When required
22 in a proceeding, only that part of the [discovery request and response] that is in issue shall be
23 filed.” E.D. Cal. L.R. 250.2-250.4; Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1). Accordingly, docket numbers 28,
24 31, and 32 are stricken and the Clerk of the Court shall make a notation on the docket to that
25 effect.

26 ///

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
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE