

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRYANT,

Plaintiff,

v.

OCHOA, Warden, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 07cv200 JM (PCL)

**ORDER DENYING AS MOOT
MOTION TO COMPEL
DISCOVERY (Doc. 103.)**

Plaintiff moved the Court for an order pursuant to Rule 37(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure compelling Defendant Mudra to answer more fully Interrogatory No. 4, written as follows: “Please state the name(s) of any and all Calipatria State prison official(s) who delegated you as the interviewer of plaintiff’s grievance/Appeal Log No. CAL-A-08-00893.” (Doc. 103-2, at 4.) Defendant Mudra initially answered the question as follows: “Defendant Mudra’s responsibility to conduct any grievance/appeal interview can be delegated by any of the following: Captain, Warden, Associate Warden, Chief Deputy Warden, Appeals Coordinator.” (Doc. 105, at 2.) Since filing the motion, Plaintiff has received a more detailed response to Interrogatory No. 4. (See Doc. 105, Exhibit C.) The pertinent part of Defendant Mudra’s response is as follows: “the delegation of this responsibility is a process. In your case, the Warden, L. Small, and the Chief Deputy Warden, T. Ochoa, assigned the grievance to the Appeals Coordinator, D. Bell, who, in turn, assigned the grievance to the Associate

cc: The Honorable Jeffrey T. Miller
All parties

1 Warden, G. Janda. Mr. Janda then assigned the grievance to Captain R. Madden, who, in turn, assigned
2 it to Mr. Mudra.” (Id.)

3 Because Defendant Mudra has provided a detailed response to Interrogatory No. 4, Plaintiff’s
4 motion to compel (doc. 103) is DENIED as moot.

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 DATED: May 7, 2009

7
8 
9 Peter C. Lewis
10 U.S. Magistrate Judge
11 United States District Court
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28