

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

DOMINGO L. CLEVELAND, SR.,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS,  
Defendant.

No. 2:16-cv-02308-MCE-AC

ORDER

Plaintiff is incarcerated and is proceeding in pro se. ECF No. 73. This matter is before the court on plaintiffs’ motion to compel depositions (ECF No. 67) and plaintiff’s motion to compel (ECF No. 71). Defendant filed an opposition (ECF No. 74). Upon review of the briefing, both motions are DENIED.

Plaintiff’s motion to compel depositions appears to seek production of transcripts from defendant’s depositions of Dr. Nima Kabirian Dehkordi on January 30, 2018, Dr. Sandy En-Lee on February 1, 2018, and Dr. Bryan Chow on January 30, 2018. ECF No. 67 at 1. Defendant represents it has already produced to plaintiff transcripts of the depositions of Drs. Dehkordi and Chow, and that the deposition of Dr. En-Lee was cancelled. ECF No. 74 at 1. For this reason, the motion to compel depositions (ECF No. 67) is DENIED as MOOT.

Plaintiff’s motion to compel simply asks defendant to produce to plaintiff a copy of “the evidence they have.” ECF No. 71 at 1. The court cannot compel discovery in such broad terms.

1 A motion to compel is the mechanism for seeking court intervention when a party has failed to  
2 respond adequately to written requests for specific discovery pursuant to the Federal Rules of  
3 Civil Procedure. When one party wants the other to provide specific documents, he must request  
4 those specific documents from other party under Rule 32. Discovery requests are not filed with  
5 the court; they are simply directed to the party from whom discovery is sought. If the party  
6 propounding the request is dissatisfied with the response to a written request for discovery, he  
7 may then bring a motion to compel under Rule 37. Such a motion must include the specific  
8 requests that were made, the responding party's responses, and the reasons for the moving party's  
9 dissatisfaction. Because the motion before the court does not demonstrate that specific discovery  
10 was requested, or provide any of the information essential to adjudication of a motion to compel,  
11 it must be DENIED.

12 It is HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to compel depositions (ECF No. 67) and  
13 motion to compel (ECF No. 71) are DENIED.

14 DATED: January 17, 2019

15   
16 ALLISON CLAIRE  
17 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28