

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

KENNETH B. GIBBS,
Plaintiff,
v.
MACCOMBER, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-0061 KJM CKD P

ORDER

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, proceeds pro se with a civil rights complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. By order of October 10, 2017, defendants were required to produce the assertedly privileged RVRs and medical reports responsive to plaintiff's Request for Production of Documents No. 7 for *in camera review* within 7 days. ECF No. 70. Defendants have complied with this order.


Having reviewed the documents submitted for *in camera review*, the court concludes that they are only minimally relevant to this action, and the balancing of the potential benefits of disclosure against the potential disadvantages weighs against disclosure. See Sanchez v. City of Santa Ana, 936 F.2d 1027, 1033-34 (9th Cir. 1990), as amended on denial of reh'g (Feb. 27, 1991), as amended on denial of reh'g (May 24, 1991) (internal citations and quotations omitted).

/////
/////

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

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that the documents submitted for *in camera review* are not required to be disclosed to plaintiff.

Dated: October 20, 2017



CAROLYN K. DELANEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12/gibb0061.incamera.docx