

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

LANCE WILLIAMS,
Plaintiff,
v.
ROMERO, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-1884 TLN DB P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding with a civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff alleges he was subjected to excessive force when a defendant closed a mechanical door on him. He further alleges defendants were deliberately indifferent to his need for medical care. On September 28, 2021, defendants filed a motion to compel plaintiff to respond to defendants' discovery requests. Plaintiff's response to that motion was due within twenty-one days after service of the motion. (See June 1, 2021 Order (citing E.D. Cal. R. 230(l)).)

Twenty-one days have passed and plaintiff has not filed any response to the motion to compel. Local Rule 230(l) provides that a party's failure to respond to a motion to compel may be deemed a waiver of any opposition to the motion. Plaintiff will be given an opportunity to explain why he has failed to file a timely response to the motion and why defendants' motion should not be granted.

////

1 Accordingly, within twenty (20) days of the filed date of this order, plaintiff shall explain
2 why he failed to file a timely opposition to defendants' September 28 motion to compel and why
3 defendants' motion should not be granted. If plaintiff fails to file a timely response to this order,
4 this court will grant defendants' motion to compel.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: November 19, 2021

7
8 
9 _____
10 DEBORAH BARNES
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 DLB:9
24 DB Prisoner Inbox/Civil Rights/R/will1884.mtc osc
25
26
27
28