

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  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

LARRY HEGGEM,

Plaintiff,

v.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY CORRECTIONS, et  
al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C11-1333RSM

ORDER ON PENDING MOTIONS

The Court, having reviewed the record in this case, does now find and ORDER:

(1) Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Dkt. # 220)

Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel (Dkt. # 220) is GRANTED. The Clerk shall appoint counsel from the *pro bono* panel to represent plaintiff in further proceedings.

(2) Motion to Return Video (Dkt. # 234)

Plaintiff's motion for the return of a CD/video he sent as evidence (Dkt. # 86) is GRANTED. The Clerk shall return the Cd/video by regular mail to plaintiff's address of record.

(3) Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. # 218)

Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of an Order which itself denied a motion for reconsideration (Dkt. # 211) is DENIED as improper. There is no provision in the local rules for reconsideration of an Order which denies a motion for reconsideration.

ORDER ON MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION - 1

1 (4) Motions to Compel (Dkt. ## 214, 216, 219, 232, 236, 238)

2 Plaintiff has filed numerous discovery motions. The motion to re-open discovery (Dkt. # 219) is  
3 STRICKEN as moot. Discovery in this case remains open until May 13, 2012. Dkt. # 224. The five  
4 motions to compel (Dkt. ## 214, 216, 232, 236, 238) are all STRICKEN for failure to comply with  
5 meet-and-confer requirements in Fed.R.Civ.P. 37 and Local Rule CR 37. The motions may be renewed  
6 by counsel as appropriate.

7 (5) Motion for a Physical and Mental Health Examination (Dkt. # 222)

8 Plaintiff's motion for a Rule 35 examination is DENIED as improper. As plaintiff has requested  
9 imaging of his abdomen in addition to his shoulders, neck, and wrist (areas that he alleges were injured  
10 by excessive force), it appears that plaintiff is actually requesting medical care, not a Rule 35  
11 independent examination for the purposes of this lawsuit. Counsel may renew the request for a Rule 35  
12 examination as appropriate.

13 DATED this 27 day of November 2012.

14 

15 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE