1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	ROMESH KANDA,
10	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-09-2197 MCE GGH P
11	VS.
12	JAMES WALKER, et al.,
13	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>
14	/
15	Plaintiff has filed his second request for an extension of time to respond to
16	defendants' interrogatories and request for production of documents. Good cause appearing, the
17	request will be granted. No further extensions of time will be granted.
18	On February 17, 2010, plaintiff filed objections to defendants' notice of
19	deposition. Plaintiff first objects that defendants did not obtain leave of court to take his
20	deposition. The December 1, 2009, scheduling order provides that defendants may depose
21	plaintiff. See December 1, 2009, order, p. 5: 12-15.
22	In his February 17, 2010, pleading, plaintiff also seeks a protective order to
23	require defendants to provide him with an interpreter at his deposition. Plaintiff alleges that he
24	does not speak English well enough and requires an interpreter who speaks Punjabi or Hindi.
25	The court cannot order defendants to provide plaintiff with an interpreter, although it may be in
26	their best interests to do so. If plaintiff does not understand the questions he is being asked, he

1	may state that on the record at his deposition.
2	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:
3	1. Plaintiff's request for an extension of time (Docket No. 37) is granted;
4	2. Plaintiff is granted twenty-eight days from the date of this order in which to
5	respond to defendants' request for production of documents and interrogatories. No further
6	extensions of time will be granted;
7	3. Plaintiff's February 17, 2010, motion for a protective order (no. 33) is denied.
8	DATED: April 2, 2010
9	/s/ Gregory G. Hollows
10	GREGORY G. HOLLOWS
11	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
12	kan2197.po
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

I

I