

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

HENRY MOUNSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

RAKESHA CHANDRA, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 04-cv-365-JPG

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Henry Mounson's Motion for Extension of Time to File Response to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment and Motion for Complete Copy of Deposition (Doc. 85). Mounson's motion, filed April 27, 2009, is dated December 7, 2007, and asserts that Mounson requires additional time to respond to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss because he was restricted from using the law library until January 22, 2008. Mounson did, in fact, respond to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment in January of 2008. The magistrate judge assigned to this case has issued his reports and recommendations, and Mounson has responded to those as well. Therefore, the Court finds Mounson's request for an extension of time moot.

Mounson also asserts that he has not received a complete copy of his deposition taken by Defendants. He complains that he was falsely told that he would have to order a copy from the court reporter who took his deposition, and that he would have to pay for the copy, most likely in advance. Mounson asserts that he was, thereby, denied access to the courts. In fact, Mounson was correctly informed of how to get a copy of his deposition. An inmate is not constitutionally entitled to a free copy of documents prepared at the expense of another. *See United States v. McCollum*, 426 U.S. 317 (1976). Here, Defendants took Mounson's deposition, and provided

the Court and Mounson with those portions of the transcript relevant to their arguments in support of summary judgment. Apart from his erroneous belief that he is constitutionally entitled to a free copy of the entire transcript of his deposition, Mounson has not informed the Court as to why he requires a copy or what he expects it will help him prove.

In addition, Mounson had previously attempted to, and been denied leave to, reopen discovery on this case, which is now entering its sixth year. The time for discovery has passed. The time for filing dispositive motions has passed. The time for filing objections to the magistrate judge's reports and recommendations has passed. Mounson's Motion for Extension of Time to File Response to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment and Motion for Complete Copy of Deposition (Doc. 85) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 30, 2009

s/ J. Phil Gilbert
J. PHIL GILBERT
DISTRICT JUDGE