



**However, as a PRC member, I am made aware of an inmate's need for AC placement.**

ECF No. 84 at 1.

As for Interrogatory No. 1, Plaintiff moves the Court to compel Ivcic to state if she instructed Defendant Pyo to sign the "802 Report No. D502308 and D504137," as specified in his request. ECF No. 82 ¶ 1. Upon review, the Court agrees that it is unclear whether Ivcic's response relative to "AC placements" is responsive in whole or in part to the specific reports identified in Plaintiff's request. Therefore, the Motion to Compel is granted as to Interrogatory No. 1.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 2.** Defendant Ivcic state is it fair to say that the Plaintiff Naranjo is not in the RHU under administrative directive 802, Section 1.B.1.a.

**ANSWER: Plaintiff's most recent PRC review only indicates that it is recommended he continue on AC status.**

ECF No. 84 at 1.

With respect to Interrogatory No. 2, Plaintiff asks that Defendants Ivcic be compelled to specifically state whether he is in the RHU under administrative directive 802, Section 1.B.1.a, as requested. ECF No. 82 ¶ 2. Again, the Court agrees that Ivcic fails to specifically respond to the question that is asked of her. The Motion to Compel is therefore granted as to Interrogatory No. 2.

**INTERROGATORY NO. 3:** Defendants Ivcic, state Plaintiff Naranjo status in SCI-Houtzdale RHU since November 2020 to the date of your response.

**ANSWER: Yes.**

ECF No. 84 at 1.

Finally, Plaintiff requests the Court to compel a response to the question he asks in Interrogatory No. 3. Upon review, the Court cannot determine what specific information Plaintiff is requesting that has not already been provided in response. Ivcic appears to have confirmed that Plaintiff has been placed in the RHU. If Plaintiff seeks further information about the nature of, or

reason for, that confinement, he must clearly state what information he is requesting so that Ivicic can meaningfully respond. Accordingly, the Motion to Compel is denied relative to Interrogatory No. 3.

An appropriate Order follows.

AND NOW, this 14<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022, it is hereby ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Discovery, ECF No. 82, is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART. Defendant Ivicic is directed to provide further responses to Interrogatories Nos. 1 and 2 by August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022. The Motion to Compel is denied in all other respects.

In accordance with the Magistrate Judges Act, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), and Rule 72.C.2 of the Local Rules of Court, the parties are allowed fourteen (14) days from the date of this Order to file an appeal to the District Judge which includes the basis for objection to this Order. Any appeal is to be submitted to the Clerk of Court, United States District Court, 700 Grant Street, Room 3110, Pittsburgh, PA 15219. Failure to file a timely appeal will constitute a waiver of any appellate rights.

BY THE COURT:

  
MAUREEN P. KELLY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

cc: The Honorable Christy Criswell Wiegand  
United States District Judge

Isaac Naranjo  
FJ 4369  
SCI Houtzdale  
Box 1000  
Houtzdale, PA 16698

All counsel of record by Notice of Electronic Filing