1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
10	JOHN ZAPATA dba ZAPATA COLLECTION, SERVICE, an Individual,					
11	Plaintiff, No. 2:09-cv-03555 GEB KJN PS					
12	V.					
13	FLINTCO, INC., an Oklahoma					
14						
15	a Political Subdivision and JOHN DOE 1-25, inclusive,					
16	Defendants. ORDER					
17	/					
18	On October 6, 2010, plaintiff filed the following two documents: (1) "Motion for					
19	Protective Order" (Dkt. No. 37); and (2) "Opposition to Monetary Sanctions, Opposition to					
20	Dismissal, Request to Modify Order, Request for Sanctions" (Dkt. No. 38). The undersigned					
21	will deny all of the relief requested in these filings.					
22	I. <u>Motion for Protective Order</u>					
23	Plaintiff's motion for a protective order pertains to the location where his					
24	deposition, which pertains to limited issues discussed in the court's prior orders (Dkt. Nos. 29,					
25	31, 36), will take place. The motion states, in its entirety: "Plaintiff requests that this court issue					
26	an order requiring that the deposition of Plaintiff be conducted in the Eastern District of					
	1					
	Deska					

1	California pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and not in Los Angeles, or a mutual site				
2	agreed by both parties." (Mot. for Protective Order at 1.)				
3	As an initial matter, plaintiff's motion is defectively noticed in that it does not				
4	conform to the notice requirements of this court's Local Rules 230(b) or 251(a). Ordinarily, the				
5	court would permit plaintiff to re-notice his motion in conformity with the Local Rules.				
6	However, the undersigned will deny plaintiff's motion because the court has already addressed				
7	the issue of the location of plaintiff's limited deposition in its order entered October 5, 2010.				
8	(Dkt. No. 36.) Nothing in plaintiff's motion for a protective order persuades the court that it				
9	should modify its October 6, 2010 order.				
10	II. <u>The "Opposition"</u>				
11	Plaintiff's document that is styled an "Opposition" opposes several of defendants'				
12	requests for sanctions included in defendants' reply to plaintiff's response to a previously entered				
13	order to show cause. Plaintiff's "Opposition" requests relief as follows:				
14	1. Plaintiff submits and requests the following from this court;				
15	A. That this court modify the order dated June 10, 2010				
16	i. That Plaintiff should not be required to go to Los Angeles for his deposition and that the Deposition is				
17	conducted at a location pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.				
18	ii. That a deadline for 100% competition of issue				
19	regarding the assignment be set within 30 calendar days.				
20	B. That the courts deny Defendant Request for monetary				
21	sanction.				
22	C. That this court imposes sanctions against Defendants for its misrepresentation and misleading of the court.				
23	D. That the court deny Defendant request for dismissal.				
24	E. That the court allows Plaintiff to proceed with its Motion				
25	for Summary Judgment.				
26	F. That the court allows Plaintiff to proceed with general				
	2				

I

discovery of its own in this matter.

G. That this court allows Plaintiff to do its filing via E-mail with the court and that all filing be sent to Plaintiff via E-Mail from the (sic).

(Dkt. No. 38 at 1-2.)

1

2

3

4

As an initial matter, plaintiff has not requested any of the affirmative relief in the
form of a motion properly noticed pursuant to Local Rules 230(b) or 251(a). Nevertheless, the
undersigned will briefly address each request.

8 First, with respect to plaintiff's requests designated by letters "B" and "D," the
9 court already denied defendants' requests for involuntary dismissal of plaintiff's case and the
10 imposition of monetary sanctions, for now, against plaintiff. (Order, Oct. 5, 2010, Dkt. No. 36.)
11 Accordingly, plaintiff's requests are moot.

12 Second, with respect to plaintiff's requests designated by letters "E," "F," and 13 "G," the court already dismissed without prejudice plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, stayed general discovery pending a determination of whether the court has subject matter 14 15 jurisdiction to hear plaintiff's claims, and rejected plaintiff's repeated requests to use the court's 16 electronic filing system. (See Dkt. Nos. 22, 23, 29.) The court has made an accommodation to 17 permit plaintiff to file one brief in electronic format, but nothing in plaintiff's "Opposition" 18 persuades the undersigned that plaintiff is entitled to the remaining requested relief. Moreover, 19 to the extent that plaintiff is anxious to conduct general discovery and file a motion for summary 20 judgement, plaintiff has been the cause of the delay because his international travel schedule has 21 delayed the progress of this case.

Third, the undersigned will deny plaintiff's requests designated as A.i and A.ii.
As stated above, the undersigned has already resolved issues pertaining to the location where
plaintiff's limited deposition will take place. (Order, Oct. 5, 2010, Dkt. No. 36.) Additionally,
the court has already set forth a briefing schedule regarding resolution of the issues related to
what defendants allege is a "sham" assignment. Nothing in plaintiff's "Opposition" supports

1	modification	of the	court's	prior	orders.
---	--------------	--------	---------	-------	---------

2	Finally, as to the relief sought under letter "C," the undersigned finds no basis for				
3	the imposition of sanctions on defendants.				
4	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:				
5		1.	Plaintiff's Motion For Protective Order (Dkt. No. 37) is denied.		
6		2.	Plaintiff's request for modification of the court's June 10, 2010 order is		
7	denied.				
8		3.	Plaintiff's request for the imposition of sanctions against defendants is		
9	denied.				
10		4.	Plaintiff's request to proceed with his motion for summary judgment is		
11	denied.				
12		5.	Plaintiff's request to conduct general discovery is denied.		
13		6.	Plaintiff's request to use the court's electronic filing system is denied,		
14	except as stated in prior orders of the court.				
15	IT IS SO ORDERED.				
16	DATED: October 7, 2010				
17 18			Faill Paking		
19			KENDALL J. NEWMAN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
			Λ		