

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  
27  
28

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

**MICHAEL GRIMES,**  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
**RICHARD RIVERMAN, et al.,**  
  
Defendants.

2:12-cv-00937 DAD P  
**ORDER MODIFYING  
DISCOVERY AND SCHEDULING  
ORDER**

Both parties have filed motions seeking to modify the court’s discovery and scheduling order to allow for additional time to complete discovery. Specifically, plaintiff requests additional time to respond to defendants’ discovery requests in light of his recent transfer to the California Institution for Men. Defense counsel requests additional time to take plaintiff’s deposition and file any motion to compel in light of plaintiff’s delay in serving his written responses to defendants’ discovery requests and because of an unforeseen medical emergency.

////

////

////

////


1 Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

2 1. Plaintiff's motion to modify the court's discovery and scheduling order (Doc. No. 51) is  
3 granted. Within thirty days of the date of service of this order, plaintiff shall serve on defense  
4 counsel his written responses to defendants' discovery requests;

5 2. Defendants' motion to modify the court's discovery and scheduling order (Doc. No. 55)  
6 is granted. Within thirty days following service of plaintiff's written discovery requests, defense  
7 counsel shall take plaintiff's deposition and file any necessary motion to compel; and

8 3. Except as otherwise provided in this order, the court's July 29, 2014 discovery and  
9 scheduling order remains in effect.

10 Dated: January 7, 2015

11 

12 DALE A. DROZD  
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

14 DAD:9  
15 grim0937.41mod(2)  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28