

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

OSCAR ANDERSON,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	CASE NO. 3:13-cv-425 (AVC)
	:	
LEO C. ARNONE, et al.,	:	
Defendants.	:	

RULING ON PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER [Doc. #25]

The plaintiff seeks a protective order preventing the defendants from transferring him to another correctional facility in retaliation for his filing this action.

The plaintiff’s request is not the proper use of a motion for protective order. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) provides that a protective order is designed to protect a party “from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense” as a result of discovery requests. The motion for protective order is denied.

Further, the plaintiff previously sought a court order preventing his transfer during the pendency of this case. The court denied the request and explained that the plaintiff has no right to be housed in any particular correctional facility. The court indicated that if he were transferred as a retaliatory act,

the plaintiff could pursue that matter in a separate lawsuit. See Doc. #24. The plaintiff has provided no evidence in support of his request. Absent evidence suggesting that the defendants are planning to transfer the plaintiff in retaliation for his filing this action, court action is not warranted.

The plaintiff's motion for protective order [Doc. #25] is **DENIED.**

So ordered at Hartford, Connecticut, this 6th day of May 2014.

/s/ Thomas P. Smith
Thomas P. Smith
United States Magistrate Judge