

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

KARL CHRISTOPHER WRIGHT, III,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 17-cv-64-pp

RAFAEL BRITO, *et al.*,

Defendant.

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO VIEW ELECTRONIC
MONITOR CAMERA FOOTAGE (DKT. NO. 52)**

Karl Christopher Wright, III is representing himself in this lawsuit. The deadline for the parties to complete discovery was April 20, 2018, and the deadline for filing summary judgment motions was May 21, 2018. Both the plaintiff and the defendants filed motions for summary judgment on the May 21, 2018 deadline date. Dkt. Nos. 38 and 50. A few days after he filed his motion for summary judgment, the plaintiff filed a letter, indicating that he would like to file a motion to view electronic monitor camera footage. Dkt. No. 52. The plaintiff asked to look at footage from the camera on pod 4D for May 8, 2016, between 11:15 AM and 2:45 PM; he wants to see if officers opened his cell door, ran into his room, and attacked him. Id.

In his complaint, the plaintiff alleged that the defendants beat and sodomized him in his cell; he narrowed down the time of the alleged assault to sometime between May 4, 2016 and May 17, 2016. Dkt. No. 1 at 1. In their motion for summary judgment, the defendants stated that May 8, 2016 was the only day the two defendants worked together during that period. Dkt. No.


40 at 4-5. It seems, then, that the plaintiff has reviewed the defendants' summary judgment motion, and is now asking to conduct further discovery on the factual assertions the defendants have made in connection with that motion.

The court issued the original scheduling order on October 17, 2017, giving the parties four months—until February 19, 2018—to conduct discovery. Dkt. No. 25. On February 12, 2018, at the request of the defendants, the court extended the discovery deadline to April 20, 2018. The plaintiff had six months to ask the defendants for any evidence he needed, including video footage. The plaintiff does not state in his motion whether he asked the defendants for any video footage during the six-month discovery period. If he did not request video footage during the discovery period, he does not explain why he did not do so. The plaintiff's request comes too late, and without explanation as to why he did not make the request sooner. The court will deny his motion without prejudice. If the plaintiff has evidence that the defendants somehow prevented him from obtaining video footage during discovery, the plaintiff may renew his motion and provide the court with that evidence.

The court **DENIES WITHOUT PREJUDICE** the plaintiff's motion for an order to view electronic monitor camera footage. Dkt. No. 52.

Dated in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, this 8th day of June, 2018.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'P. Pepper', written over a horizontal line.

HON. PAMELA PEPPER
United States District Judge