

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

KASEY F. HOFFMAN,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
KEVIN JONES, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-1748-EFB P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He has filed three discovery motions – two to compel (ECF Nos. 19 & 20) and one for additional interrogatories and requests for production (ECF No. 17). Defendant Jones has filed oppositions to each of those motions. ECF Nos. 21, 23, & 24. In the wake of those oppositions, plaintiff has filed four supplements to his motions and a declaration in support of one of those supplements. ECF Nos. 27-31. This is not permitted by the local rules which, instead, permit him a single reply in support of each motion. *See* Local Rule 230(1).

Accordingly, the court will consider plaintiff’s first two supplements (ECF Nos. 27 & 28) as his “replies.” These supplements were filed on October 11, 2017 and are closest in time to the relevant oppositions. *See* ECF No. 28 at 6; *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266 (1988) (establishing rule that a prisoner’s court document is deemed filed on the date the prisoner delivered the document to prison officials for mailing). The court will strike plaintiff’s other supplements. As

1 noted above, the local rules do not contemplate numerous supplements to a motion. Permitting  
2 such filings impairs the court's ability to timely adjudicate the relevant motions. Moreover, these  
3 continuously filed supplements are unfair to defendant who, having filed his oppositions in a  
4 timely manner, is not afforded an opportunity to address the various arguments and exhibits  
5 raised after the fact.

6 The relevant discovery motions – ECF Nos. 17, 19, & 20 – are deemed submitted based  
7 on the limitations outlined in the foregoing paragraph. The court will not consider any further  
8 filings from plaintiff in support of these motions.

9 Based on the foregoing, it is ORDERED that:

10 1. The supplements filed at ECF Nos. 29 & 30 and the declaration filed at ECF No. 31  
11 are STRICKEN and the Clerk is directed to make a notation on the docket; and

12 2. The motion for leave for additional interrogatories (ECF No. 17) and the motions to  
13 compel (ECF Nos. 19 & 20) are deemed submitted. The court will not consider further filings  
14 from plaintiff in support of these motions.

15 DATED: November 14, 2017.

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