

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

RANDY KENT BARKER, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-0062-JAM-EFB (TEMP)

ORDER

On September 24, 2015, defendant Randy Kent Barker, a federal prisoner proceeding without counsel, filed a motion to compel.¹ ECF No. 40. As the moving party, defendant bears the burden of informing the court of (1) which discovery requests are the subject of his motion to compel, (2) which of plaintiff’s responses are disputed, (3) why he believes plaintiff’s responses are deficient, (4) why plaintiff’s objections are not justified, and (5) why the information he seeks through discovery is relevant to this action. *See, e.g., Brooks v. Alameida*, No. CIV S-03-2343 JAM EFB P, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9568, 2009 WL 331358 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 10, 2009) (“Without knowing which responses plaintiff seeks to compel or on what grounds, the court cannot grant plaintiff’s motion”); *Ellis v. Cambra*, No. CIV 02-05646-AWI-SMS PC, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS

¹ This motion is before the undersigned pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(1), which provides that all discovery motions are among the duties to be performed by the assigned magistrate judge in civil matters.

1 109050, 2008 WL 860523, at *4 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2008) (“Plaintiff must inform the court
2 which discovery requests are the subject of his motion to compel, and, for each disputed response,
3 inform the court why the information sought is relevant and why Defendant’s objections are not
4 justified.”).

5 Here, defendant’s motion fails to provide any of the necessary information. In this regard,
6 defendant’s motion simply states that it seeks to compel answers from plaintiff’s “trial attorneys,”
7 to questions including “[d]efine a ‘Dollar,’” “[d]efine a ‘Federal Reserve Note,’” and “[d]efine a
8 ‘Sovereign White Christian Man.’” ECF No. 40 at 1-2. In the absence of any further information
9 there is no basis for granting defendant’s motion.

10 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendant’s September 24, 2015 motion to
11 compel, ECF No. 40, is denied.

12 DATED: January 19, 2016.

13 
14 EDMUND F. BRENNAN
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28