

MINUTES OF THE COURT

3:14-cv-00189-MMD-WGC

Date: April 28, 2015

Page 2

Defendants' opposition argues that although Plaintiff's discovery was dated January 20, 2015, Defendants did not receive the discovery until February 23, 2015, and that three days later on February 26, 2015, they received Plaintiff's letter concerning the status of his discovery. (Doc. # 26 at 1.) Defendants state this is documented by Exhibit A, a copy of Plaintiff's discovery, date stamped "Feb. 23, 2015" and Exhibit B, Plaintiff's letter, date stamped Feb. 26, 2015, which was attached to Defendants's opposition. Defendants submit they wrote to Plaintiff requesting a thirty day extension to provide responses from February 23, 2015, but did not receive any objection to such from Plaintiff. Defendants state they provided their responses on March 17, 2015. (*Id.*, at 1-2; Exhibits A, B and C (*id.*, at 26-1).)

Plaintiff did not file a reply to his motion. Because neither the Plaintiff nor the Defendants submitted a copy of their responses to the requests for production, the court is unclear what exactly it is that Plaintiff disputes. In accordance with Local Rule 26-7(a), Plaintiff's motion to compel (Doc. # 25) is **DENIED**.

Motion for Depositions (Doc. # 27)

Also before the court is Plaintiff's Motion for Depositions. (Doc. # 27.) Plaintiff seeks to depose Defendants Isidro Baca, Frank Dreesen, James Stogner and Lisa Walsh. (*Id.*, at 1.) The Defendants have filed a limited objection. (Doc. # 28.) Defendants state they have no opposition to Plaintiff conducting depositions. However, to the extent Plaintiff may be seeking to have the Defendants or the Office of the Attorney General incur the expense or otherwise facilitate Plaintiff's depositions, Defendants state it is not their responsibility to do so. (*Id.* at 1-2.)

Plaintiff represents he is submitting the motion for depositions "because [the defendants] have not been forthright in my request for production of document." (*Id.*) Although Plaintiff admits the Defendants produced documents responsive to his requests, he states the Defendants refused to produce "any and all documents Plaintiff have requested in order for him to start his Interrogatories." Plaintiff submits the scheduling order may also need to be adjusted. Therefore, the court also interprets Plaintiff's motion for depositions as a motion for an extension of the discovery deadline.

With regard to the component of Plaintiff's motion pertaining to taking depositions, Plaintiff's motion - submitted after the discovery deadline has expired - is untimely. Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 30, Plaintiff does not need leave of court to notice depositions. However, Plaintiff would also have to satisfy other requirements of the Rule, such as serving a subpoena with the appropriate witness fees and expenses and arranging for a time and place for the depositions, logistics for which would probably have to be coordinated with the Nevada Department of Corrections. The component of Plaintiff's motion (Doc. # 27) which seeks an order for depositions is **DENIED**.

///

