

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 DWAYNE GILES, No. 2:11-cv-1825-WBS-EFB P  
12 Plaintiff,  
13 v.  
14 TOM FELKER, et al., ORDER  
15 Defendants.

17 Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42  
18 U.S.C. § 1983. He has filed a motion to compel defendants to answer his discovery requests.  
19 ECF No. 83. Defendants Felker, Nachiondo, and Wong oppose plaintiff's motion, and defendant  
20 Roche has not filed any response. ECF Nos. 84, 85. As explained below, plaintiff's motion to  
21 compel is denied as moot.

22 The court screened plaintiff's first amended complaint on November 19, 2012, and found  
23 that it stated cognizable claims against defendants Felker, Nachiondo, Roche, and Wong. ECF  
24 No. 19. Nachiondo filed an answer to plaintiff's amended complaint on April 10, 2014, ECF No.  
25 51, and defendants Felker, Roche, and Wong did the same on April 15, 2014, ECF No. 52.

26 On April 21, 2014, the court issued a Discovery and Scheduling Order (“scheduling  
27 order”). ECF No. 53. Plaintiff subsequently filed a motion to modify the scheduling order. ECF  
28 No. 72. On October 7, 2014, the court granted plaintiff’s motion and modified the scheduling

1 order. ECF No. 82. The modified scheduling order explains that the parties may conduct  
2 discovery until December 12, 2014, any motions necessary to compel discovery must be filed by  
3 that date, and that all requests for discovery pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 31, 33, 34, or 36 must be  
4 served no later than October 14, 2014. *Id.* at 4.

5 The day before the court modified the scheduling order, however, plaintiff filed the instant  
6 motion to compel. ECF No. 83. Because the court had not yet ruled on plaintiff's motion to  
7 modify the scheduling order, plaintiff requested that the court rule on that motion or, in the  
8 alternative, compel defendants to answer his discovery requests. *Id.* at 2. In their opposition to  
9 plaintiff's motion to compel, defendants explain that, in light of the modified scheduling order,  
10 they are withdrawing their objection to plaintiff's discovery requests as untimely and will respond  
11 without plaintiff re-serving the requests. ECF No. 84 at 2; ECF No. 85 at 2. Because defendants  
12 have indicated that they will voluntarily respond to plaintiff's discovery requests, plaintiff's  
13 motion to compel is denied as moot.<sup>1</sup>

14 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to compel (ECF No. 83)  
15 is DENIED.

16 DATED: November 13, 2014.



17 EDMUND F. BRENNAN  
18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> As noted above, defendant Roche has not filed a response to plaintiff's motion to  
28 compel. In the event that Roche does not join Felker, Wong, and Nachiondo in voluntarily  
responding to plaintiff's discovery requests, plaintiff may file another motion to compel with the  
court.