

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

6 ROBERT EARLE JOHNSON,  
7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 RICHARD MORGAN, et al.,  
10 Defendants.

Case No. 3:16-cv-05738-BHS/TLF

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART DKT. 68  
MOTION TO HOLD SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT PROCEEDINGS IN  
ABEYANCE

11 This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's motion to delay summary judgment  
12 proceedings until the Court enters a new scheduling order and written orders on plaintiff's  
13 motions to compel. Dkt. 68. The Court grants an extension of time so that Mr. Johnson will not  
14 be required to submit a response to the summary judgment motion (Dkt. 72) until Judge Settle  
15 has ruled on the plaintiff's objections (Dkt. 69) to the Court's Order of October 23, 2017 (Dkt.  
16 67).

17 In the Motion to Hold Summary Judgment in Abeyance, plaintiff also asks the Court to  
18 enter written orders on his motions to compel answers from defendant Morgan to interrogatories  
19 5, 6, 7, 8, 18, and 21; answers from defendant Hammond to interrogatories 6, 7, 12, and 14;  
20 responses from defendant Hammond to first set of request for admissions 4 and second set 3 and  
21 13; and answers from defendant Warner to supplemental interrogatories 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, and  
22 13. *See* Dkt. 44.

23  
24  
25 ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART  
DKT. 68 MOTION TO HOLD SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
PROCEEDINGS IN ABEYANCE - 1

1 The undersigned ruled orally on these motions to compel, at telephonic conferences on  
2 August 24, 2017, and September 7, 2017. The Court denied plaintiff's motions with respect to  
3 each discovery item listed above.

4 The minute orders from August 24, 2017, state:

5 The verbal ruling of the Court is: that plaintiffs First Set of Requests for  
6 Admission (RFA) #4, and Second Set of Requests for Admission (RFA) #3 and  
7 #13, as to defendant Hammond, have been sufficiently responded to by the  
8 defense. The Court declines to enter an order compelling any further response  
9 from the defense as to those three Requests for Admission.

10 Dkt. 59.

11 The minute orders from September 7, 2017, state: "After hearing from the parties, and for  
12 reasons stated on the record, the Court DENIED Plaintiff's [Dkt.] 44 MOTION to Compel  
13 Disclosure and Discovery." Dkt. 60. Plaintiff's motions to compel at Dkt. 44 included the  
14 discovery items that plaintiff now seeks written orders on.

15 The Court has broad discretion to manage discovery-related matters. *Blackburn v. U.S.*,  
16 100 F.3d 1426, 1436 (9th Cir. 1996); *Avila v. Willits Envtl. Remediation Trust*, 633 F.3d 828,  
17 833 (9th Cir. 2011). This includes deciding whether to rule orally or enter written orders on  
18 motions to compel discovery: Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) requires a magistrate judge to "promptly  
19 conduct the required proceedings" when hearing a non-dispositive matter in a civil case, and  
20 "when appropriate, issue a written order stating the decision" (emphasis added). The  
21 undersigned concluded that in the interest of a "just, speedy, and inexpensive determination,"  
22 oral rulings were more appropriate on plaintiff's motion to compel responses on numerous  
23 discovery items. Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

1 The undersigned explained the Court's reasoning in denying plaintiff's motions to  
2 compel at the two telephonic conferences. Plaintiff cites no authority that would require this  
3 Court to enter written orders on those motions.

4 Plaintiff also asks the Court to delay summary judgment proceedings until it issues a new  
5 pretrial scheduling order.

6 The Court is not required to enter written scheduling orders in this type of case. Local  
7 Civil Rule 16(b)(6); Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(B)(iv). Nonetheless, Magistrate Judge Strombom  
8 entered a written scheduling order on October 31, 2016. Dkt. 16. The Court subsequently  
9 extended the deadlines set in that order, most recently at the telephonic conference on September  
10 7, 2017. The minute orders from that conference, Dkt. 60, state: "The following deadlines have  
11 been extended: Discovery to be completed by 10/11/2017, Dispositive motions due by  
12 11/13/2017."

13 Plaintiff asserts that this minute entry "is confusing, and does not provide the necessary  
14 information setting deadlines for Plaintiff and opposing counsel." Dkt. 68. The undersigned finds  
15 the minute entry's language to be clear and unambiguous.

16 Accordingly, the plaintiff's motion (Dkt. 68) is **GRANTED IN PART** only for an  
17 extension of time for plaintiff to respond to the defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt.  
18 72). The plaintiff shall have an extension of time to **January 8, 2018** in which to respond to the  
19 defendants' summary judgment motion. In all other respects, the plaintiff's motion is **DENIED**.  
20 The Clerk is directed to re-note the motion for summary judgment to January 12, 2018. The  
21 Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to the plaintiff.

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

Dated this 20th day of November, 2017.



---

Theresa L. Fricke  
United States Magistrate Judge