

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

TIO DINERO SESSOMS,
Plaintiff,
v.
JOHN PATRICK KELLER, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:16-cv-1943-WBS-EFB P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a former state prisoner proceeding through counsel in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendant Keller has filed a motion to compel (ECF No. 63), to which plaintiff has responded.¹ ECF No. 64.

Defendant argues that plaintiff failed to provide any response at all to defendant’s special interrogatories and requests for production of documents. ECF No. 63. In his pro se response, plaintiff concedes as much, stating his belief that defendant needs to “re-write” the motion because all deadlines in this case were “vacated.” ECF No. 64. Plaintiff appears to be confused by the related case order entered in this action. Indeed, the related case order issued on October 19, 2018, vacated all deadlines set in plaintiff’s *second* case, number 17-cv-304. ECF No. 61.

////

¹ Plaintiff filed that response before he was represented by counsel.

1 That order, however, has no impact on plaintiff's duty to respond to discovery in this case (or in
2 the second case).

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendant Keller's motion to compel (ECF
4 No. 63) is GRANTED. Plaintiff shall serve responses to defendant's outstanding discovery
5 requests within 45 days of the date of this order.

6 DATED: February 8, 2019.

7 
8 EDMUND F. BRENNAN
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28