

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

SY LEE CASTLE,)	No. C 12-2193 LHK (PR)
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER DENYING
)	PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO
v.)	COMPEL DISCOVERY
)	
M. SEPULVEDA,)	(Docket No. 27)
)	
Defendant.)	
<hr style="width: 350px; margin-left: 0;"/>		

Plaintiff, a state prisoner, filed the instant *pro se* prisoner complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion to compel discovery. The Court may grant a motion to compel discovery only after Plaintiff satisfies the “meet and confer” requirements of the discovery rules. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(2)(A) (providing that a motion to compel must include certification that movant has in good faith conferred and attempted to confer with non-disclosing party in effort to secure disclosure without court action); N.D. Cal. Civ. R. 37-1 (same). Because Plaintiff is detained, however, he is not required to meet and confer with Defendant in person. Rather, if his discovery requests are denied, and he intends to seek a motion to compel, he must send a letter to Defendant to that effect, offering Defendant one last opportunity to provide him with the sought-after information. Here, Plaintiff has not filed the requisite certification showing that he has met and conferred with Defendant about any non-disclosure. Thus, Plaintiff’s motion to compel is DENIED without prejudice as premature.

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 5/1/13



LUCY H. KOH
United States District Judge