

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
SPRINGFIELD DIVISION**

FRED LELAND,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	11-CV-3232
	)	
DR. HUBBARD et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

**OPINION**

SUE E. MYERSCOUGH, U.S. District Judge:

Plaintiff is pursuing claims for deliberate indifference to his glaucoma.

The case is in the process of discovery.

Plaintiff has filed a “motion to disclose medical records,” in which he asserts that he has been attempting to obtain his medical records for months. However, whether these attempts have been made through discovery requests or through freedom of information requests is not clear. Plaintiff’s medical records are central to his claims, and Defendants have not responded to this motion. The Court will direct

Defendants to provide Plaintiff his medical records for the period January 1, 2010 to the present, subject to appropriate objections by Defendants. If Plaintiff seeks medical records which are not possessed by the IDOC, he should file a motion for a subpoena, listing the name and address of the nonparty who possesses those records.

Plaintiff has filed two motions for the appointment of pro bono counsel. His prior motion for counsel was denied on December 30, 2011. For the reasons stated in that order, the Court still concludes that Plaintiff appears competent to proceed pro se. However, Plaintiff may file another motion for counsel attaching his relevant medical records and setting forth the level of education he has achieved outside prison, whether he is currently taking any classes or has obtained any degrees or educational certificates inside prison, and his scores on the adult basic education test administered in prison, if available.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1) Plaintiff's motion to disclose medical records is granted (d/e 34).

By June 25, 2012, Defendants are directed to produce to Plaintiff all of

his medical records from January 1, 2010 to the date of this order, which are in their possession or control. In lieu of production, Defendants may file appropriate objections to this order by June 11, 2012.

2) Plaintiff's motions for the appointment of counsel are denied (d/e's 35, 38), with leave to renew.

3) The motion to substitute attorney by Defendant Fuqua is granted (d/e 39).

4) Defendant Hubbard's unopposed motion for a protective order is granted (d/e 30). The clerk is directed to affix the Court's electronic signature to the order and to docket the order.

ENTERED: May 31, 2012

FOR THE COURT:

s/Sue E. Myerscough  
SUE E. MYERSCOUGH  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE