

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

LAWRENCE GEORGE HASH,

Plaintiff,

v.

P. FAGGIANELLI, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-1721 TLN AC P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Currently pending before the court are plaintiff’s motions to compel and motion to exceed the page-limit for his second motion to compel. ECF Nos. 106, 112, 113.

The motion to exceed the page limits will be granted. However, given the extensive scope of the already pending motions and plaintiff’s expressed intention to file similar motions to compel against the remaining thirteen defendants, the court will stay briefing on the pending motions and the time for filing any further motions to compel will be vacated.¹ While this case has been exempted from the normal requirement to confer regarding discovery disputes prior to bringing them before the court (ECF No. 99 at 6), the court finds good cause to reinstate the

¹ The deadline for filing motions to compel against defendants Austin, Boyd, Brida, Cruzen, Johnson, Just, Lemmons, Muhammad, Perera, Sandy, Shirley, Silva, Solorzano, and Thomas is currently May 5, 2023. ECF No. 103. The deadline with respect to defendants Faggianelli, Farinas, and Schwimmer is currently June 23, 2023. ECF No. 109.

1 requirement in this instance. The parties will therefore be required to meet—either
2 telephonically, by video, or in person—to discuss any disputes plaintiff has to discovery
3 responses that he has received up to this point. Failure to confer regarding a dispute will be
4 grounds for denying any motion to compel as to that issue.²

5 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 6 1. Plaintiff’s motion to exceed the page limit (ECF No. 112) is GRANTED.
- 7 2. Briefing on plaintiff’s pending motions to compel (ECF Nos. 106, 113) is STAYED.
- 8 3. The deadlines for filing motions to compel are VACATED.

9 4. Defendants shall have forty-five days from the service of this order to schedule and
10 conduct a telephonic, video, or in person meeting with plaintiff to discuss any disputes plaintiff
11 has with respect to discovery responses he has received, including those disputes outlined in the
12 pending motions to compel.

13 5. Within seven days of the parties’ meeting, defendants shall notify the court of the date
14 the meeting took place.

15 6. Within fourteen days of the meeting, plaintiff shall notify the court whether any of the
16 disputes raised in his motions to compel have been resolved and identify the requests for which
17 disputes remain. He shall also notify the court whether he intends to file any further motions to
18 compel. Following plaintiff’s notice, a briefing schedule will issue as needed. Failure to notify
19 the court of any remaining disputes, either currently pending or yet to be raised, will be
20 interpreted to mean that no disputes remain and the pending motions to compel will be denied.

- 21 7. The parties may seek additional time to confer if necessary.

22 DATED: April 13, 2023

23 
24 ALLISON CLAIRE
25 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

26
27 ² The court recognizes that plaintiff still has time to serve discovery requests on defendants
28 Faggianelli, Farina, and Schwimmer, and any requests for which he has yet to receive a response
are not included within the scope of this order.