UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

LEROY COLLINS,

Plaintiff,

v.

PATRICK HENDRIX, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:15-cv-01696-JCM-CWH

ORDER

Presently before the court is plaintiff's motion to compel (ECF No. 79), filed on May 31, 2018. Defendants Romeo Aranas, James G. Cox, Patrick Hendricks, and Dwight Neven filed a response (ECF No. 80) on June 13, 2018. Plaintiff did not file a reply.

Also before the court is plaintiff's motion to extend the dispositive motion deadline (ECF No. 87), filed on August 10, 2018. Defendants filed a notice of non-opposition (ECF No. 88) on August 14, 2018.

I. INTRODUCTION

This is a *pro se* civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging excessive force and deliberate indifference to a serious medical need. (Second Amended Compl. (ECF No. 19).) Plaintiff's claims arise from an incident where defendant Patrick Hendrix struck him with an electric cart. (*Id.*) Plaintiff sustained injuries as a result of the impact and was allegedly denied medical treatment. (*Id.*) Plaintiff now moves to compel video recordings from the incident and to extend the dispositive motion deadline. (Mot. to Compel (ECF No. 79); Mot. to Extend (ECF No. 87).)

II. MOTION TO COMPEL

Plaintiff moves the court to compel defendants to produce video recordings from the cameras in the vicinity of the alleged incident. (Mot. to Compel (ECF No. 79).) Defendants

argue that plaintiff was supplied with a compact disc containing video files of the incident, and that defendant was provided supervised access to review the materials. (Response (ECF No. 80).) Included with defendants' response is a declaration from the High Desert State Prison law library supervisor, Jacques Graham. (ECF No. 80-5.) Graham's declaration states that the law library is in possession of the disputed compact disc, and that library records indicate plaintiff reviewed the materials on April 26, 2018, May 7, 2018, May 17, 2018 and May 21, 2018. (*Id.*) Given that defendants have provided plaintiff with access to the recordings, the court will deny plaintiff's motion to compel.

III. MOTION TO EXTEND DISPOSITIVE MOTION DEADLINE

Plaintiff moves for a 30-day extension of the dispositive motion deadline. (Mot. to Extend (ECF No. 87).) Defendants do not oppose the request. The court will therefore extend the dispositive motion deadline for 30 days.

IV. CONCLUSION

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to compel (ECF No. 79) is DENIED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to extend the dispositive motion deadline (ECF No. 87) is GRANTED. The parties have until September 10, 2018 to file dispositive motions.

DATED: August 31, 2018

C.W. HOFFMAN, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE