

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

GLEN W. ROBISON,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:10-cv-2954 JAM JFM (PC)

vs.

PARAMVIR SAHOTA, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Several matters are pending before the court.

On January 13, 2012, plaintiff filed a motion for sanctions. Plaintiff seeks imposition of sanctions against defendants for failure to timely serve him with a notice for his deposition, which was conducted and completed on December 16, 2011. Plaintiff contends that he was not served with notice of the deposition until December 8, 2011, and did not receive the notice until December 9, 2011, giving him only “five working days notice” of the deposition. Defendants oppose the motion on the ground that plaintiff agreed to go forward with the deposition and has therefore waived any objection. Plaintiff disputes that he agreed to proceed with the deposition voluntarily, contending that defendants tried to get him to state on the record that he would not proceed with the deposition so that the case would be dismissed. See Notice of

1 Motion in Reply to the Defendant's [sic] Opposition to Plaintiff Motion for Sanction [sic], filed  
2 March 21, 2012, at 2.

3 Rule 30 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides in relevant part that "[a]  
4 party who wants to depose a person by oral questions must give reasonable written notice to  
5 every other party." Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(1). The rule does not require fourteen days notice.  
6 Plaintiff has made no showing that the notice he received in this case was not reasonable. His  
7 motion for sanctions will therefore be denied.

8 On March 9, 2012, defendants filed a motion for a fourteen day extension of time  
9 to file a pretrial motion. Plaintiff opposes defendants' motion, but on March 13, 2012, he filed a  
10 motion for a thirty day extension of time to file a pretrial motion. Defendants have not opposed  
11 plaintiff's motion. On March 23, 2012, defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. Good  
12 cause appearing, defendants' motion for extension of time will be granted and defendants'  
13 motion deemed timely filed. Plaintiff's motion for extension of time will also be granted and  
14 plaintiff will be granted thirty days from the date of this order in which to file and serve an  
15 opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment and, as appropriate, a cross-motion for  
16 summary judgment. Defendants' reply brief and opposition, if any, will be due fourteen days  
17 thereafter, and plaintiff's reply in support of any cross-motion for summary judgment will be due  
18 fourteen days after service of an opposition thereto.

19 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 20 1. Plaintiff's January 13, 2012 motion for sanctions is denied;
- 21 2. Defendants' March 9, 2012 motion for extension of time is granted;
- 22 3. Plaintiff's March 13, 2012 motion for extension of time is granted;
- 23 4. Defendants' March 23, 2012 motion for summary judgment is deemed timely  
24 filed; and
- 25 5. Plaintiff is granted thirty days from the date of this order in which to file and  
26 serve an opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment and, as appropriate, a cross-

1 motion for summary judgment. Defendants' reply brief and opposition, if any, shall be filed and  
2 served not later than fourteen days thereafter, and plaintiff's reply in support of any cross-motion  
3 for summary judgment shall be filed and served not later than fourteen days after service of an  
4 opposition thereto.

5 DATED: March 30, 2012.

6  
7   
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

9 12/md  
10 robi2954.o3

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26