1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 No. 2:09-cv-1523 LKK AC P DEVONTE B. HARRIS, 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. **ORDER** 14 L. ZAMUDIO, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff has filed a request for a seven-day extension of time to file a motion for summary judgment. In light of the pendency of defendants' September 24, 2013 motion for summary 18 19 judgment, plaintiff will be permitted additional time to file a cross-motion for summary judgment 20 along with his opposition to defendants' motion. 21 Also pending before the court is plaintiff's August 5, 2013 motion to compel production 22 of documents. ECF No. 62. Plaintiff sought further responses to his requests for production of 23 documents (RFP) nos. 7 and 8 propounded upon defendant Forsterer, and further responses to 24 RFP nos. 4, 5, 6 and 9 propounded upon defendant Walker. In opposition (ECF No. 64), 25 defendants Forsterer and Walker indicate that they have supplemented their responses to these 26 RFPs. Defendants contend that these supplemental responses have rendered plaintiff's motion to 27 compel further discovery moot. 28 Defendants have provided their supplemental responses, which identify the documents

that have now been provided to plaintiff. The court's review of the motion and of defendants' supplemental responses confirms that the supplemental responses and production resolve the discovery dispute. No further order of the court could enhance the supplemented responses. Moreover, plaintiff filed no reply contesting the adequacy of the supplemented discovery responses. The motion therefore will be denied as moot. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. Plaintiff's September 23, 2013 motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 69) is enlarged and is granted; 2. Plaintiff is granted thirty days from the date of this order in which to file any cross-motion for summary judgment and his opposition to defendants' September 24, 2014 motion for summary judgment. 3. Plaintiff's motion to compel further production of documents from defendants (ECF No. 62) is denied as moot. DATED: October 3, 2013 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE AC:009/md harr1523.mtc+