

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CURTIS NUNEZ, JR.,
Plaintiff,
v.
K. M. PORTER, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2: 12-cv-2775 JAM KJN P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner, proceeding without counsel, with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On September 27, 2016, the undersigned granted in part and denied in part plaintiff’s motion to reopen discovery. (ECF No. 82.) The undersigned ordered defendant to respond to the request for admissions and request for production of documents served by plaintiff on December 3, 2015. (Id.)

After receiving defendant’s response to his discovery requests, plaintiff filed a motion for in camera review. (ECF No. 84.) Plaintiff alleged that defendant provided him with two redacted emails. (Id.) Plaintiff requested that the court conduct an in camera review of the unredacted versions of the emails to determine whether the redacted information was relevant. (Id.)


On November 22, 2016, defendant filed a response to plaintiff’s motion for in camera review. (ECF No. 85.) Defendant stated that the redacted emails concerned information about nonparties and defendant submitted a privilege log to plaintiff to that effect. (Id.) Defendant did

1 not oppose the court's in camera review of the emails. (Id.)

2 On January 19, 2017, the undersigned ordered defendant to submit the at-issue emails for
3 in camera review. (ECF No. 86.) Defendant has now submitted the unredacted emails for in
4 camera review. After reviewing the mails, the undersigned finds that the redacted information is
5 most likely not relevant. However, in an abundance of caution, plaintiff is ordered to submit the
6 request for production of documents relevant to the at-issue emails so that the undersigned may
7 make a final determination regarding relevancy.

8 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that within fourteen days of the date of this
9 order, plaintiff shall provide the court with a copy of the request for production of documents
10 relevant to the at-issue emails; plaintiff shall also identify which specific request for production of
11 documents in response to which defendant produced the emails.

12 Dated: February 10, 2017

13 
14 _____
15 KENDALL J. NEWMAN
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17 Nun2775.fb

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28