

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

TEVIN LEE HARRIS,

 Plaintiff,

 v.

R. VALENCIA, et al.,

 Defendant.

No. 2: 19-cv-1751 JAM KJN P

ORDER

On August 16, 2021, plaintiff filed objections to the magistrate judge’s order filed August 4, 2021 denying plaintiff’s motion to compel. (ECF Nos. 74, 74.) The undersigned construes plaintiff’s objections as a request for reconsideration. Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule 303(f), a magistrate judge’s orders shall be upheld unless “clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” Id. Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that it does not appear that the magistrate judge’s ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.¹

¹ In the motion to compel, filed June 21, 2021, plaintiff requested that defendant provide him with his medical and mental health records, C-file records and Unit Health Records. The magistrate judge denied the motion to compel as premature because plaintiff failed to serve defendant with a request for production of documents regarding these records before filing the motion to compel. In the request for reconsideration, plaintiff argues that he requested the records from defendant in interrogatories served on July 20, 2021. If plaintiff is dissatisfied with defendant’s response to his interrogatories, he may file a separate motion to compel. However, as the magistrate judge advised plaintiff, documents should be requested in a request for production of documents.

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

Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration, the order of the magistrate judge filed August 4, 2021 is affirmed.

Dated: September 3, 2021

/s/ John A. Mendez
THE HONORABLE JOHN A. MENDEZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE