

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RENE MEDINA,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-10-0502 LKK GGH P

vs.

KATHLEEN DICKINSON, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

By Order filed on November 1, 2011, pursuant to plaintiff’s motion, discovery was “re-opened for the limited purpose of permitting plaintiff to serve his prepared discovery requests upon defendants within fourteen days of the filed date of [that] order.” The discovery deadline was extended to December 28, 2011, and the pretrial dispositive motion was extended to April 11, 2012. Thereafter, on December 15, 2011, plaintiff filed a “motion for an order compelling discovery,” averring that he had served his first set of interrogatories and his first set of requests for production of documents, upon defendants Clark, Hurtado, Gonzalez and Swarthout on November 15, 2011, but had yet to receive answers or any documents. Plaintiff stated that he had also filed a copy of his discovery requests in court on the same date. See Motion. Although it would not have been necessary to have filed his discovery requests at the time he avers that he served them upon defendants, the undersigned notes that nothing in the case docket indicates that plaintiff’s discovery requests were filed.

