

1 XAVIER BECERRA
 Attorney General of California
 2 MARISA Y. KIRSCHENBAUER
 Supervising Deputy Attorney General
 3 ROBERT W. HENKELS
 Deputy Attorney General
 4 State Bar No. 255410
 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
 5 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
 Telephone: (415) 703-5836
 6 Fax: (415) 703-5843
 E-mail: Robert.Henkels@doj.ca.gov
 7 *Attorneys for Defendants*
A. Adams, E. Bridgnell, D. Bright, E. DelaRosa, J.
 8 *Dunlap, L. Gamboa, K. Kumar, F. Mejia, Orfield, E.*
Talanoa, J. Turner, F. Tuvera, M. Ulloa, J.
 9 *Villafuerte, and T. Wy*

10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 11 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

15 **ALFREDO GONZALEZ,**
 Plaintiff,
 16
 17 v.
 18 **F. TUVERA, et al.,**
 Defendants.
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24

C 16-2294 JST (PR)
**STIPULATION REGARDING
 DISCOVERY DISAGREEMENT AND
 FOR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR
 PLAINTIFF TO RESPOND TO MOTION
 FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT;
 [PROPOSED] ORDER**

Judge: The Honorable Jon S. Tigar
 Trial Date: N/A
 Action Filed: April 27, 2016

1 Plaintiff Alfredo Gonzalez, an inmate at Salinas Valley State Prison in pro se, and
2 Defendants A. Adams, E. Bridgnell, D. Bright, E. DelaRosa, J. Dunlap, L. Gamboa, K. Kumar, F.
3 Mejia, Orfield, E. Talanoa, J. Turner, F. Tuvera, M. Ulloa, J. Villafuerte, and T. Wy, by and
4 through their counsel of record, agree and stipulate as follows:

5 1. Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment challenging Plaintiff's claim that
6 Defendants were deliberately indifferent to his serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth
7 Amendment. Plaintiff wishes to view all available discovery before preparing his response.

8 2. The parties are currently working to resolve their discovery disagreement. Plaintiff
9 has filed a motion to compel production of discovery against Defendant Tuvera. Defense counsel
10 provided Plaintiff with over 1500 medical records, and mistakenly believed that this resolved the
11 disagreement. Plaintiff and Defense counsel have discussed this issue on numerous occasions,
12 most recently on April 11 and 13, 2018. On April 11, 2018, Plaintiff informed Defense counsel
13 that he sought additional records, and that he would provide Defense counsel with a letter
14 specifying those record. Unfortunately, Plaintiff became preoccupied with unrelated but
15 important matters, and was unable to provide Defense counsel with that letter.

16 3. Both parties agree and stipulate that Plaintiff should have a full and fair opportunity
17 to conduct discovery before responding to Defendants' motion for summary judgment, and that it
18 is in both parties' interest and the Court's for the parties to have further opportunity to resolve
19 their current disagreement.

20 4. The parties agree and request that Plaintiff's deadline to file a response to
21 Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment be extended forty-five days, until June 28, 2018, and
22 for additional time to resolve their discovery dispute.

23 5. The parties have agreed to discuss this issue again on Monday, April 23, 2018. At
24 that time, the parties shall address whether they can resolve their discovery disagreement, whether
25 they should request to be referred to a magistrate judge for assistance, or whether they shall seek
26 further guidance from this Court.

27 5. Plaintiff's deadline to file a response to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment
28 has previously been extended three times.

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

6. This request for an extension of time will not affect the time management in this case, as it is not presently scheduled for trial.

IT IS SO STIPULATED.

Dated: April 16, 2018

Respectfully submitted,
XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General of California
MARISA Y. KIRSCHENBAUER
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

/s/ Robert W. Henkels
ROBERT W. HENKELS
Deputy Attorney General
Attorneys for Defendants

Dated: _____, 2018

Plaintiff Alfredo Gonzalez, in pro se

[Signature on Following Page]
Alfredo Gonzalez

1 6. This request for an extension of time will not affect the time management in this case,
2 as it is not presently scheduled for trial.

3
4 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

5 Dated: _____, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

6 XAVIER BECERRA
7 Attorney General of California
8 MARISA Y. KIRSCHENBAUER
9 Supervising Deputy Attorney General

10 _____
11 ROBERT W. HENKELS
12 Deputy Attorney General
13 Attorneys for Defendants

14 Dated: 4/16, 2018

Plaintiff Alfredo Gonzalez, in pro se

15
16 
17 _____
18 Alfredo Gonzalez

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 ///

28 ///

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

ORDER OF THE COURT

The Court, having read the parties’ stipulation, and good cause appearing, hereby GRANTS the parties’ request for extensions of time. Plaintiff Alfredo Gonzalez’s may file a response to Defendants’ motion for summary judgment on or before **June 28, 2018**. Defendants may file a reply brief no later than **14 days** after the opposition is filed. Should the parties fail to resolve their discovery dispute, they shall so advise the Court in a joint letter consistent with this Court’s Standing Order for All Civil Cases.

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 16, 2018

SF2016103881
Gonzalez - Stip re Disc. EOT Resp. Summ. J. (final) doc.doc

