

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAWRENCE GEORGE HASH,)	No. C 08-3729 MMC (PR)
Plaintiff,)	ORDER SETTING BRIEFING
v.)	SCHEDULE RE: UNRESOLVED
CHARLES LEE, et al.,)	DISCOVERY MATTERS
Defendants.)	

On August 4, 2008, plaintiff, a California prisoner then incarcerated at the Correctional Training Facility at Soledad and proceeding pro se, filed the above-titled civil rights action.¹ On June 5, 2012, defendants filed a request for extensions of time to complete discovery and to file a dispositive motion. In support thereof, defendants submitted a declaration stating plaintiff had been disregarding his discovery obligations and that defendants would be filing a motion to dismiss, or alternatively to compel. In response, plaintiff filed a document opposing the requested modification and titled in part “Renewed Objections to Defendants’ Proposed Deposition.”

By order filed June 7, 2012, the Court granted defendants’ request for extensions of time; defendants’ motion for summary judgment or other dispositive motion is currently due no later than November 5, 2012. If defendants intend to file a motion with respect to any unresolved discovery matters, they shall do so no later than **August 20, 2012**. Plaintiff shall

¹ Plaintiff currently is incarcerated in the California State Prison (“CSP”) at Solano.


1 file any response to defendants' motion no later than **September 10, 2012**; plaintiff's
2 response must include any objections to discovery and shall not incorporate by reference
3 material from his prior filings. Defendants shall file their reply no later than **September 24,**
4 **2012.**

5 The parties are reminded that they must make a good faith effort to meet and confer to
6 attempt to resolve any discovery dispute before filing any motion to compel. See Fed. R.
7 Civ. P. 37(1); N.D. Cal. Civ. Local Rule 37-1.

8 At the time they file a dispositive motion, defendants must send to plaintiff the
9 appropriate notice required by Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 1998), if they move
10 for summary judgment, or by Wyatt v. Terhune, 315 F.3d 1108 (9th Cir. 2003), if they move
11 to dismiss for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. See Woods v. Carey, No. 09-
12 15548, slip op. 7871 (9th Cir. July 6, 2012).

13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 DATED: July 23, 2012

15 
16 MAXINE M. CHESNEY
17 United States District Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28