1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8 9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
10		
11	SKY MILLER,	CASE NO. C10-5638BHS/JRC
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING A MOTION TO
13	V.	COMPEL
14	DICK MORGAN, et al.,	
	Dotondonto	
15	Defendants.	
16		the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to
16 17	This civil rights action has been referred to	the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to
16 17 18	This civil rights action has been referred to 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and 636(b)(1)(B) and b	Local Magistrate Judge Rules MJR 1, MJR 3,
16 17 18 19	This civil rights action has been referred to	Local Magistrate Judge Rules MJR 1, MJR 3,
16 17 18 19 20	This civil rights action has been referred to 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and 636(b)(1)(B) and b	Local Magistrate Judge Rules MJR 1, MJR 3,
16 17 18 19 20 21	This civil rights action has been referred to 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and 636(b)(1)(B) and I and MJR 4. The matter is before the court on a se 19). Defendants have responded (ECF No. 20). I	Local Magistrate Judge Rules MJR 1, MJR 3,
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	This civil rights action has been referred to 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and 636(b)(1)(B) and I and MJR 4. The matter is before the court on a se 19). Defendants have responded (ECF No. 20). I	Local Magistrate Judge Rules MJR 1, MJR 3, econd motion to compel discovery (ECF No. Plaintiff has replied (ECF No. 21). t two requests for production of documents
16 17 18 19 20 21	This civil rights action has been referred to 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and 636(b)(1)(B) and I and MJR 4. The matter is before the court on a se 19). Defendants have responded (ECF No. 20). I Plaintiff withdraws his motion as to all bu (ECF No. 21). Requests 11 and 12 are still at issu	Local Magistrate Judge Rules MJR 1, MJR 3, econd motion to compel discovery (ECF No. Plaintiff has replied (ECF No. 21). t two requests for production of documents
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	This civil rights action has been referred to 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and 636(b)(1)(B) and I and MJR 4. The matter is before the court on a se 19). Defendants have responded (ECF No. 20). I Plaintiff withdraws his motion as to all bu (ECF No. 21). Requests 11 and 12 are still at issu	Local Magistrate Judge Rules MJR 1, MJR 3, econd motion to compel discovery (ECF No. Plaintiff has replied (ECF No. 21). t two requests for production of documents ne. for a list of all employees who worked in the
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	This civil rights action has been referred to 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and 636(b)(1)(B) and I and MJR 4. The matter is before the court on a se 19). Defendants have responded (ECF No. 20). I Plaintiff withdraws his motion as to all bu (ECF No. 21). Requests 11 and 12 are still at issu In request for production 11, plaintiff asks	Local Magistrate Judge Rules MJR 1, MJR 3, econd motion to compel discovery (ECF No. Plaintiff has replied (ECF No. 21). t two requests for production of documents ne. for a list of all employees who worked in the e when alleged retaliatory acts took place.
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	This civil rights action has been referred to 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and 636(b)(1)(B) and I and MJR 4. The matter is before the court on a se 19). Defendants have responded (ECF No. 20). I Plaintiff withdraws his motion as to all bu (ECF No. 21). Requests 11 and 12 are still at issu In request for production 11, plaintiff asks mail room at McNeil Island during the time frame	Local Magistrate Judge Rules MJR 1, MJR 3, econd motion to compel discovery (ECF No. Plaintiff has replied (ECF No. 21). t two requests for production of documents ne. for a list of all employees who worked in the e when alleged retaliatory acts took place. as and a request for production cannot force a

information through another form of discovery or ask for documents that do exist. The motion to compel a response to request for production 11 is DENIED.

Request for production 12 asks for medical records from September 2009 through October 1, 2010. Defendants respond by stating that the records are available for review and copying. An order compelling production is not needed since the records are available for review and copying. The fact that there may be a fee for copies does not make a motion to compel proper. The in forma pauperis statute does not relieve a plaintiff of the costs of obtaining copies. Tedder v. Odel, 890 F.2d 210, 211-12 (9th Cir. 1989). The motion is DENIED. DATED this 8th day of March, 2011. (maturo lano J. Richard Creatura United States Magistrate Judge

ORDER - 2