

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT TACOMA

8 DAVID TROUPE,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 WILLIAM SWAIN, et al.,

12 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:16-CV-05380-RJB-DWC

ORDER ON MOTION FOR
PROTECTIVE ORDER

13 Plaintiff David Troupe, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, initiated this action
14 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Presently pending before the Court is Defendants' Motion for
15 Protective Order ("Motion"), wherein Defendants request an order limiting discovery. Dkt. 43.¹
16 Plaintiff filed his Response and Defendants filed their Reply. Dkt. 45, 46.

17 The Court has broad discretionary powers to control discovery. *Little v. City of Seattle*,
18 863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir. 1988). Upon showing of good cause, the Court may deny or limit
19 discovery "to protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue
20 burden or expense[.]" Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c); *see also GTE Wireless, Inc. v. Qualcomm, Inc.*, 192
21 F.R.D. 284, 285–86 (S.D. Cal. 2000). A court may also relieve a party of the burdens of

22
23 ¹ Also pending in this action are: (1) Defendants' Motion to Dismiss in Part under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(c)
24 (Judgment on the Pleadings), which is ready for the Court's consideration on September 16, 2016 (Dkt. 41); and (2)
Defendants' Motion and Memorandum for Summary Judgment and Dismissal under Fed. R. Civ. P. 56, which is
ready for the Court's consideration on October 7, 2016 (Dkt. 48).

1 discovery while a dispositive motion is pending. *DiMartini v. Ferrin*, 889 F.2d 922 (9th Cir.
2 1989), *amended at* 906 F.2d 465 (9th Cir. 1990); *Rae v. Union Bank*, 725 F.2d 478 (9th Cir.
3 1984).

4 Discovery began on August 5, 2016. *See* Dkt. 40. As of September 2, 2016, Plaintiff had
5 not sent discovery requests to Defendants. Dkt. 47, Judge Supplemental Declaration, ¶4. The
6 discovery completion date is February 6, 2017. Dkt. 40. Therefore, at this time, the Court finds
7 Defendants' Motion premature. If Plaintiff begins to propound discovery in a manner which is
8 unduly burdensome on Defendants or unnecessary in light of the pending dispositive motions,²
9 Defendants may move for a protective order at that time. Accordingly, Defendants' Motion is
10 denied without prejudice.³

11 Dated this 9th day of September, 2016.

12 

13 _____
14 David W. Christel
15 United States Magistrate Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 _____
23 ² Defendants have moved, in part, to dismiss this case based on Plaintiff's failure to state a claim and
24 failure to exhaust his administrative remedies. *See* Dkt. 41, 48.

³ Defendants requested the Court stay discovery pending the outcome of the Motion. *See* Dkt. 43. As the
Court has ruled on the Motion, the request to stay discovery is denied as moot.