

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

RAYMOND LEE GOINS,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
A. DIMACULANGAN, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:18-cv-0034 TLN CKD P

ORDER

Plaintiff is a California prisoner proceeding pro se. On November 30, 2018, plaintiff filed a document in which, among other things, plaintiff requests copies of documents identified as documents 20 and 21 on the court’s docket. Docket entries 20 and 21 arise from the same document which was submitted by a California Department of Corrections (CDCR) official and concerns which remaining defendants are willing to waive service of process and appear in this action, and which are not. This document was submitted by CDCR pursuant to an agreement between the court, CDCR, and the California Office of the Attorney General with the goal of expediting the appearance of CDCR employees as defendants in actions before the court and simplifying the service of process procedure in such actions. Communications from CDCR in furtherance of this agreement, such as the document represented by docket entries 20 and 21, often contain information as to the whereabouts of current or former CDCR employees including residential addresses. The court has agreed that this information will only be used by the court to

1 facilitate service of process and will not be made public to the extent a plaintiff's ability to pursue  
2 his claims will not be impacted. For all of these reasons, and because, at this point, plaintiff does  
3 not require any of the information included in the document identified to pursue his remaining  
4 claims, plaintiff's request for a copy of the document will be denied.

5 Also, this action is proceeding under the court's "Post-Screening ADR Project."  
6 Accordingly, the court will most likely hold a settlement conference prior to permitting discovery.  
7 Plaintiff requests that the court not hold a settlement conference until all defendants are served.  
8 Plaintiff does not indicate why he makes this request.

9 Plaintiff's request will be denied as there is not good cause to delay a settlement  
10 conference with respect to all claims simply because one defendant or a few defendants have not  
11 been served. Furthermore, it may be possible for plaintiff to negotiate with respect to all of his  
12 claims even if certain defendants have not been served if plaintiff, the Attorney General and  
13 CDCR are agreeable to that.

14 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 15 1. Plaintiff's request for a copy of the document represented by docket entries 20 and 21  
16 is denied.
- 17 2. Plaintiff's request that the court not hold a settlement conference in this action until all  
18 defendants are served is denied.

19 Dated: December 11, 2018

20   
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

24 1  
25 goin0034.ssc