

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

GERALD SPENCE,  
  
  Plaintiff,  
  
  v.  
  
STAMBAUGH, et al.,  
  
  Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-1170 WBS AC P

ORDER

In response to this court’s order filed May 12, 2020 (ECF No. 138), plaintiff states that he inadvertently dropped the word “sets” in reference to the interrogatories and requests for admission he seeks from defendant Wong. See ECF No. 148. Plaintiff states that he simultaneously served two sets of interrogatories and one set of admission requests on defendant Wong. Id. This additional discovery appears reasonable. However, plaintiff’s objections to the court’s rulings concerning the other defendants are overruled for the reasons stated in the court’s prior order.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Plaintiff’s request to propound two sets of interrogatories and one set of admission requests on defendant Wong is granted, *nunc pro tunc*.

////

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

2. Defendant Wong shall respond to this discovery within three weeks after service of the requests.

3. Two weeks after receiving Wong's responses, plaintiff may further propound on defendant Wong one additional set of admission requests and/or a request for production of documents OR plaintiff shall file and serve a statement informing the court that he seeks no further discovery from defendant Wong.

4. If plaintiff serves further requests for admissions and/or production on defendant Wong, her responses are due within fourteen (14) days thereafter.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: June 3, 2020

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ALLISON CLAIRE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE