

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

KENNETH WILKINS,

Plaintiff,

v.

BYRNE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:16-cv-00249-MMD-WGC

ORDER

Re: ECF No. 47

Plaintiff filed a motion to compel production of discovery on September 6, 2017. (ECF No. 36.) The court held a hearing on the motion on October 12, 2017. (ECF No. 45.) In connection with Plaintiff's requests for production of documents, the court directed Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Johnson to advise the warden at Lovelock Correctional Center (LCC) that Plaintiff should be given an opportunity to review his I-file. (ECF No. 45 at 2, 3.)

On October 23, 2017, Plaintiff filed a document which he titled an objection to the Magistrate Judge's order. (ECF No. 47.) He states that while the court directed DAG Johnson to advise the warden at LCC that Plaintiff should be able to review his I-file, but this does not include an order that he be allowed to make copies of documents within his I-file. (*Id.*) Plaintiff asks that he be allowed to do so, in order to respond to Defendants' motion for summary judgment. (*Id.*)

Defendants have filed a response. (ECF No. 54.) Defendants argue that they advised the court and Plaintiff during the hearing that Plaintiff would be allowed to review his I-file and make copies to attach to court filings or motions. The internal process is such that Plaintiff may flag pages to be copied and submit a brass slip to pay for the copies, and can then identify a filing he wishes to attach the documents to for submission to the court. Plaintiff may not maintain copies of the documents in his cell.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

The court agrees that Plaintiff's filing is not an objection to the court's order, but is more appropriately characterized as a request for reconsideration or clarification of the scope of the court's order. Therefore, it is appropriate for the undersigned to address the filing.

If the prior order did not make it clear, then, consistent with NDOC policies, Plaintiff is permitted to flag pages in his I-file to be copied so that such documents may accompany a submission to the court, but he may not possess the documents in his cell.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: November 7, 2017.



WILLIAM G. COBB
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE