


1 Here, under the discovery and scheduling order, discovery opened on June 29, 2023, and
2 all discovery requests were to be propounded no later than August 21, 2023. (ECF No. 22 at 5 ¶
3 6.) Given such deadlines, plaintiff fails to demonstrate how the recent thirty-day denial of
4 photocopy services impacted his ability to propound or respond to discovery in this case. Indeed,
5 plaintiff provided no specific facts as to what documents have been impacted, either by
6 photocopy delays or delays in receipt of legal mail. Plaintiff fails to identify what additional
7 discovery he needs. Moreover, defendants demonstrate that on July 17, 2023, plaintiff served
8 requests for production of documents and requests for admissions, and defendants responded on
9 September 15, 2023. (ECF No. 24 at 5.) On October 4, 2023, plaintiff brought documents to his
10 deposition and defendants' counsel helped plaintiff get assistance to make a copy of the
11 documents to send to defendants' counsel. (ECF No. 24 at 5.) Plaintiff did not file a reply or
12 rebut counsel's declaration.

13 Plaintiff's conclusory request for a 60 day stay of this action is unsupported by specific
14 facts or evidence.

15 The record reflects that plaintiff was able to propound discovery and he fails to
16 demonstrate good cause to extend the discovery deadline. His motion also fails to show that a
17 stay of this case is warranted.

18 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion (ECF No. 23) is denied.

19 Dated: November 13, 2023

20 
21 _____
22 KENDALL J. NEWMAN
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

24 /brow2118.sty
25
26
27
28