1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	JOHN CLINT DRAPER,
11	Plaintiff, No. 2:10-cv-0032 KJM EFB P
12	VS.
13	D. ROSARIO,
14	Defendant. <u>ORDER</u>
15	/
16	On November 26, 2012, plaintiff filed objections to the magistrate judge's order
17	filed November 2, 2012, which denied plaintiff's motion to compel and motion for writs of
18	habeas corpus ad testificandum. The court construes plaintiff's objections as a motion for
19	reconsideration. Under E.D. Local Rule 303(f), a magistrate judge's order shall be upheld unless
20	"clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that the
21	magistrate judge's ruling is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
22	Although plaintiff's claim is not the clearest, he appears to argue that the
23	magistrate judge's order is improper because this case has been reassigned from Judge Damrell
24	to the undersigned. Under the Local Rule 302(c)(1) & (17) however, the magistrate judge
25	assigned to a case handles discovery motions and actions brought by prisoners, including
26	/////
	1

1	dispositive and non-dispositive motions. The reassignment to the undersigned of this case did
2	not change the magistrate judge's duties in this case.
3	Although plaintiff's motion to compel asked for a copy of the video-taped
4	deposition, in his motion for reconsideration he asks for a written copy of the deposition. (ECF
5	74). Despite his in forma pauperis status, plaintiff is not entitled to a copy of the deposition
6	either at governmental or the defendant's expense. Allen v. Hernandez, No.
7	1:05-cv-00145-AWI-SMS-PC 2008 WL 4078742, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 29, 2008)
8	Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration, the order of
9	the magistrate judge filed November 2, 2012, is affirmed.
10	DATED: January 16, 2013.
11	InA Muller
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	2

I