

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

EDWARD T. FURNACE,

Plaintiff,

v.

K. KNUCKLES, et al.,

Defendants.

No. C 09-6075 MMC

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM ORDER OF
MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Before the Court is the “Motion for Relief from Nondispositive Pretrial Order of Magistrate Judge,” filed June 9, 2015, by the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (“CDCR”), by which CDCR seeks relief from a nondispositive discovery order issued by Magistrate Judge Elizabeth D. Laporte requiring CDCR to produce, inter alia, (1) “documents relating to [p]laintiff contained in third party internal affairs files”; (2) “limited portions of the [facility] map [that] are relevant to [p]laintiff[’s] claims”; and (3) “protocols for responding to alarms” (see Order Regarding Outstanding Issues, filed April 23, 2015 at 5, 8, 9).


The Court, having reviewed the papers filed in support of the motion¹ and having

¹The Court did not order a response from plaintiff. See Civil L.R. 72-2 (providing “[u]nless otherwise ordered by the assigned District Judge, no response need be filed and no hearing will be held concerning the motion”).

1 fully considered the matter, hereby DENIES the motion, for the reason that CDCR has
2 failed to show the subject order is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. See 28 U.S.C
3 636(b)(1)(A) (providing district court may reconsider magistrate judge's order where it has
4 been shown to be "clearly erroneous or contrary to law").

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated: June 12, 2015

7 
8 MAXINE M. CHESNEY
9 United States District Judge

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28