

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Jose Guadalupe Rocha v. Matt Winden

Rocha v. Winden · No. 1:23-cv-00756-GPG-SBP · Decided March 10, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Colorado grants in part and denies in part Jose Guadalupe Rocha’s motion to reopen discovery, compel production, and seek sanctions. The court finds that Rocha did not demonstrate good cause or diligence warranting the broader discovery and depositions requested, but permits limited discovery concerning Centennial Correctional Facility classification records that the defendant agreed were relevant. The order addresses discovery under Rule 16(b)(4), the relevance and proportionality of requested materials, and the relationship between the discovery dispute and the defendant’s pending qualified-immunity summary-judgment motion.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Colorado
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Susan Prose
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Colorado
DECIDED	March 10, 2026
DOCKET	1:23-cv-00756-GPG-SBP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to reopen discovery, compel production, and obtain sanctions while a defendant's motion for summary judgment was pending. The magistrate judge granted the motion in part to permit narrowly limited discovery concerning documents the defendant agreed were relevant and denied it in all other respects.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Modification or reopening of a scheduling order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) requires good cause and the judge's consent; the movant must show that the deadline could not be met despite diligent efforts. The decision whether to extend or reopen discovery is committed to the court's sound discretion, evaluated under the factors identified in Smith v. United States. Discovery must also be relevant and proportional to the needs of the case.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated

PARTIES

Jose Guadalupe Rocha v. Matt Winden, Warden of Centennial Correctional Facility

TOPICS

discovery dispute

sanctions

qualified immunity

summary judgment

section 1983

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

prisoner civil rights

constitutional law

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Rocha established good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4) to reopen discovery broadly for additional documents and depositions.
2. Whether the defendant's concession that limited Centennial Correctional Facility classification documents were relevant justified narrowly limited additional discovery.
3. Whether Winden or his counsel engaged in sanctionable discovery conduct under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37.

HOLDINGS

1. Rocha failed to show good cause to reopen discovery for the broad categories of documents and depositions he sought because the record demonstrated a lack of diligence, the requested discovery would prejudice Winden and expand the case, and the discovery was unlikely to lead to relevant admissible evidence on qualified immunity.
2. Limited good cause existed to reopen discovery so that Winden could produce the relevant Centennial Correctional Facility Internal Classification Committee minutes and related documents, followed by five interrogatories limited to those documents.
3. Sanctions were unwarranted because the record did not establish obstruction, misrepresentation, or other sanctionable conduct by Winden or his counsel.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Rocha claimed that prison and investigative records, including classification materials, Office of Inspector General records, and an audio recording of a disciplinary hearing, were necessary to oppose Winden's summary-judgment motion on Rocha's First Amendment retaliation claim. The record showed that discovery materials had been provided through the prison law library, that Rocha did not attempt to access the hearing audio for months, and that he did not communicate with defense counsel for an extended period after receiving discovery responses. Winden nevertheless conceded that limited Internal Classification Committee materials concerning Rocha's transfer from Centennial Correctional Facility to Colorado State Penitentiary were relevant and should be produced.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Rocha brought a First Amendment retaliation claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Winden in his individual capacity, alleging that Winden caused Rocha to be transferred after Rocha invoked his right to remain silent during a drug-introduction investigation. Discovery had previously been closed and was temporarily reopened to permit an additional document request. After Winden moved for summary judgment, Rocha sought broader additional discovery under Rules 16(b) and 37, asserting that he lacked materials needed to respond. Following supplemental briefing and a status conference, the court allowed production of limited Centennial Correctional Facility classification materials and five related interrogatories, but denied the requested broader discovery and sanctions.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Gorsuch, Ltd., B.C. v. Wells Fargo Nat'l Bank Assoc.*, 771 F.3d 1230, 1240 (10th Cir. 2014)
- *Pumpco, Inc. v. Schenker Int'l, Inc.*, 204 F.R.D. 667, 668 (D. Colo. 2001)
- *Strope v. Collins*, 315 F. App'x 57, 61 (10th Cir. 2009)
- *Sher v. Amica Mut. Ins. Co.*, 722 F. Supp. 3d 1176, 1181 (D. Colo. 2024)
- *Colo. Visionary Acad. v. Medtronic, Inc.*, 194 F.R.D. 684, 688 (D. Colo. 2000)
- *Smith v. United States*, 834 F.2d 166, 169 (10th Cir. 1987)
- *Surat v. Klamser*, *Surat v. Klamser*, 52 F.4th 1261, 1270-71 (10th Cir. 2022)
- *Felders ex rel. Smedley v. Malcom*, 755 F.3d 870, 877-78 (10th Cir. 2014)
- *Medina v. Cram*, 252 F.3d 1124, 1128 (10th Cir. 2001)
- *Pahls v. Thomas*, 718 F.3d 1210, 1227 (10th Cir. 2013)
- *Dodds v. Richardson*, 614 F.3d 1185, 1193-94 (10th Cir. 2010)
- *Sinclair Wyo. Ref. Co. v. A & B Builders, Ltd.*, 989 F.3d 747, 783 (10th Cir. 2021)
- *Morales-Fernandez v. INS*, 418 F.3d 1116, 1119, 1122 (10th Cir. 2005)