1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	AN AMERICA COMPANIA DE CAMPAGIO COMPANIA	
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
10	AT TACOMA	
11	TIMOTHY R ENGLISH,	
12	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C14-5328 RBL-JRC
13	v.	ORDER ON PENDING MOTIONS
14	CLARK COUNTY JAIL, GARRY LUCAS, JACKIE BATTIES,	
15	Defendant.	
16	The District Court has referred this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights action to United States	
17	Magistrate Judge J. Richard Creatura pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and (B), and local	
18	Magistrate Judge Rules MJR1, MJR3 and MJR4.	
19	Currently before the Court are three motions filed by plaintiff (Dkt. 21, 24, and 25).	
20	Defendants have also filed a motion for summary judgment that is noted for consideration on	
21		
22	January 23, 2015 (Dkt. 32). In the first of plaintiff's motions, plaintiff asks the Court to extend the discovery deadline in this action so that he can obtain medical records (Dkt. 21). Defendants	
23	respond to plaintiff's motion and state that plaintiff has obtained his medical records (Dkt. 23).	
24	respond to plaintiff's motion and state that plaintif	i has obtained his medical records (Dkt. 23).

Defendants oppose extending discovery (Dkt. 22). Plaintiff did not reply to defendants' 2 response. 3 The Court has wide discretion regarding discovery and the standard of review is abuse of discretion. Wharton v. Calderon, 127 F.3d 1201, 1205 (9th Cir. 1997). According to defendants, plaintiff has his medical records. Plaintiff has not contradicted defendants' 5 assertions or stated that he needs records from any other source. Plaintiff fails to show good 6 7 cause for any extension of the discovery cutoff in this action. The Court denies plaintiff's motion to extend discovery. 8 9 Plaintiff's second and third motions address affirmative defenses that defendants raise in their motion for summary judgment (Dkt. 32). Plaintiff attempts to have the Court rule that these 10 11 affirmative defenses do not apply. A Magistrate Judge hearing an action by referral may not rule 12 on a dispositive motion and must instead issue a Report and Recommendation to the District 13 Court Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). A ruling against plaintiff on either of these motions would be 14 dispositive of this action. Accordingly, the Court will defer ruling on these two motions, and 15 address these issues in the Report and Recommendation on defendant' motion for summary 16 judgment that is noted for consideration on January 23, 2015. Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of January, 2015. 17 18 19 J. Richard Creatura United States Magistrate Judge 20 21 22 23 24