

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Colton James Rood v. Carrillo

Rood v. Carrillo · No. 1:22-cv-00449-SAB (PC) · Decided December 15, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California granted Defendant’s motion to compel in a prisoner civil rights action. The court ordered Plaintiff to serve further responses to discovery requests within fourteen days of service of the order.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Stanley A. Boone
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 15, 2025
DOCKET	1:22-cv-00449-SAB (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights action, opposed Defendant's motion to compel responses to discovery requests.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Discovery-management decisions and motions to compel are committed to the court's discretion; under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, evasive or incomplete discovery responses are treated as failures to respond.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- prisoners rights
- civil rights
- sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Defendant was entitled to an order compelling Plaintiff to provide further responses to the outstanding discovery requests.
2. Whether Plaintiff's asserted extraordinary circumstances and contention that the motion was premature justified denying or deferring the motion to compel.

HOLDINGS

1. A party may move to compel discovery when the opposing party fails to provide adequate responses, and an evasive or incomplete response is treated as a failure to respond under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37.
2. Plaintiff was required to submit further responses to Defendant's discovery requests served on November 21, 2024, within fourteen days after service of the order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“An objection at the time of the examination – whether to evidence, to a party’s conduct, to the officer’s qualifications, to the manner of taking the deposition, or to any other aspect of the deposition – must be noted on the record, but the examination still proceeds.” (at 1)

*“Based on Plaintiff's concession that he will provide further responses to Defendant’s outstanding discovery requests, it is **HEREBY ORDERED:**” (at 2)*

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Defendant served Plaintiff with interrogatories and requests for production on November 21, 2024. Defendant contended that Plaintiff's responses were deficient and evasive. Plaintiff asserted that extraordinary circumstances impaired his ability to respond fully but conceded that he would provide further responses.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Defendant moved to compel Plaintiff's further responses to interrogatories and document requests served on November 21, 2024. Plaintiff opposed the motion, asserting extraordinary circumstances and arguing that the motion was premature, while conceding that he would provide further responses. The court granted the motion and ordered Plaintiff to serve further responses within fourteen days after service of the order.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Campbell v. Gerrans, 592 F.2d 1054, 1057 (9th Cir. 1979)
- Kastigar v. United States, 406 U.S. 441, 444 (1972)
- Maness v. Meyers, 419 U.S. 449, 461 (1975)

