

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO

Damon Crist v. Sheriff Matthew Clifford; Ada County; Sgt. Meachum; Deputy Tamondong; Sgt. Wroblewski; and Michael Brewer

Crist · No. 1:24-cv-00531-DKG · Decided January 14, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Idaho ruled on several motions filed by pro se plaintiff Damon Victor Crist in a civil rights action against Ada County officials and others. The court denied as moot the motions concerning printing access and discovery, denied a motion to stay the discovery schedule, and denied a motion to stay further proceedings. The order was issued by Magistrate Judge Debora K. Grasham on January 14, 2026.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Debora K. Grasham
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Idaho
DECIDED	January 14, 2026
DOCKET	1:24-cv-00531-DKG
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff, a pro se pretrial detainee who brought a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, moved for printing access, to compel discovery, to stay the discovery schedule, and to stay further proceedings. The district court resolved those motions while noting that defendants' motion for summary judgment was not yet ripe.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied its broad discretion in managing discovery and evaluating requests to stay proceedings; no formal appellate standard of review was stated.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court memorandum decision and order; persuasive at most
PARTIES	Damon Crist v. Sheriff Matthew Clifford, Ada County, Sgt. Meachum, Deputy Tamondong, Sgt. Wroblewski, Michael Brewer

TOPICS

discovery dispute civil procedure prisoners rights section 1983 injunctions

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure civil rights prisoner litigation discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Crist's request for an order allowing him to print discovery materials from the Ada County Jail became moot after his transfer from that facility.
2. Whether Crist was entitled to an order compelling discovery when defendants represented that they had provided the required disclosures and responsive documents and Crist offered no evidence showing otherwise.
3. Whether the discovery schedule should be stayed because of defendants' alleged discovery failures.
4. Whether further proceedings should be stayed for 180 days based on Crist's transfer to Utah and asserted inability to litigate.

HOLDINGS

1. A request for injunctive relief concerning conditions or policies at a facility is moot when the plaintiff is no longer incarcerated there and shows no reasonable expectation of returning. Crist's motion for printing access was therefore denied as moot.
2. A motion to compel was not warranted where defendants had provided the mandatory disclosures and responsive discovery, and the plaintiff offered no evidence that additional relevant and required discovery remained outstanding. The motion to compel was denied as moot.
3. A request to stay the discovery schedule was properly denied when it was based on alleged discovery failures that did not establish a basis for compelling discovery.
4. A litigant is not entitled to a stay based on a vague assertion that incarceration or transfer will make litigation impossible when the record contains no evidence that litigating from the new facility will be more difficult. Crist's motion for a further stay was denied on the merits and also because it violated the court's order limiting parties to three pending motions.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

When the action was filed, Crist was a pretrial detainee at the Ada County Jail and proceeded pro se and in forma pauperis. He alleged that jail officials would not permit him to print material from a discovery flash drive, but he was later transferred to Utah custody. Defendants represented that they had provided the required disclosures and responsive discovery, including approximately 7,000 documents and more than 1,100 pages of additional documents, and Crist provided no evidentiary support for his contrary assertions.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Crist filed a civil-rights action while detained at the Ada County Jail. After his transfer to the Utah Department of Corrections, he filed several motions concerning access to discovery, discovery production, and stays of the proceedings. The court denied the printing-access and motion-to-compel requests as moot, denied the discovery-schedule stay, and denied the stay of further proceedings on the merits and because it violated the court's three-motion limit.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Alvarez v. Hill, 667 F.3d 1061, 1064 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Johnson v. Moore, 948 F.2d 517, 519 (9th Cir. 1991)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO DAMON CRIST, Case No. 1:24-cv-00531-DKG Plaintiff, MEMORANDUM DECISION AND v. ORDER SHERIFF MATTHEW CLIFFORD; ADA COUNTY; SGT. MEACHUM; DEPUTY TAMONDONG; SGT. WROBLEWSKI; and MICHAEL BREWER, Defendants. At the time this civil rights action was filed, Plaintiff Damon Victor Crist—who is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis—was a pretrial detainee held in the Ada County Jail.

Plaintiff has since been transferred to the custody of the Utah Department of Corrections and is incarcerated at the Utah State Correctional Facility. See Dkt. 54. Now pending are several motions filed by Plaintiff.¹ The Court will address Plaintiff's motions below. 1. Plaintiff's Motion Requesting Order Re: Printing Discovery Content from Flash Drive Plaintiff claims that the Ada County Jail has refused to permit him to print material from the discovery flash drive he received from Defendants.

Defendants state ¹ Also pending is Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, but that Motion is not yet ripe for the Court's consideration. that they have informed Plaintiff he may print documents for the same cost as he may purchase copies. Plaintiff is no longer being held in the Ada County Jail.

Accordingly, this motion must be denied as moot. See, e.g., Alvarez v. Hill, 667 F.3d 1061, 1064 (9th Cir. 2012) (claims for injunctive relief moot after release from custody because inmate is "no longer subject to the prison conditions or policies he challenges"); see also Johnson v. Moore, 948 F.2d 517, 519 (9th Cir. 1991) ("Johnson was transferred to a federal correctional facility in Washington.

Because he has demonstrated no reasonable expectation of returning to [his previous correctional facility], his claims for injunctive relief relating to [that facility's] policies are moot.”). 2. Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b) allows parties to obtain discovery “regarding any nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party's claim or defense and proportional to the needs of the case.” Fed.

R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). Although relevance has an expansive meaning, district courts are given broad discretion to apply discovery rules to properly effect the policy of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—namely, to “secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

In addition, this case is subject to the Court's Standard Disclosure and Discovery Order for Pro Se Prisoner Civil Rights Cases. See Dkt. 11. That Order sets forth the Court's mandatory disclosure requirements. If an answering party fails to adequately respond to discovery requests, the propounding party can move for an order compelling discovery under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a).

An “evasive or incomplete” response to a discovery request “must be treated as a failure” to respond. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(4). Plaintiff asserts Defendants have not provided certain mandatory disclosures. See Dkt. 32, 32-1. Defendants, on the other hand, state that they provided 7,000 documents as required by the Court's disclosure order. See Dkt. 42. Plaintiff does not contest Defendants' statement, but he believes there are more documents responsive to the mandatory disclosure requirements that he has not been provided.

However, Plaintiff offers no evidence in support of this claim. Thus, the Court will deny this portion of the Motion to Compel as moot, given that Defendants did provide their mandatory disclosures. Plaintiff also propounded interrogatories and requests for production seeking responses to requests identified in Plaintiff's meet-and-confer letter, which he sent prior to filing the Motion to Compel.

Defendants acknowledge that it took them longer than 30 days to respond, because the production contained over 1,100 pages of additional documents. Dkt. 42-1. But they did provide the responsive documents to Plaintiff. Defendants have submitted evidence to this effect. See Exhibits to Dkt. 42-1. Plaintiff does not deny that Defendants provided these documents.

Instead, he claims that the documents are “irrelevant.” Dkt. 48 at 1. But Plaintiff has submitted no evidence to support this allegation. Accordingly, the Court concludes that Defendants have provided the relevant and required discovery and will deny as moot this portion Plaintiff's Motion to Compel. 3. Plaintiff's Motion to Stay the Discovery Schedule Plaintiff asks the Court to stay the discovery schedule—the deadline for which passed while the Court was considering the motion—based on Defendants' alleged failure to comply with discovery requirements.

Because the Court will deny the Motion to Compel, it will also deny the Motion to Stay the Discovery Schedule. 4. Motion to Stay Further Proceedings Plaintiff seeks an “immediate stay” lasting 180 days. Dkt. 49 at 1. Plaintiff bases this request on the fact that his Idaho criminal case has become final. When he filed the motion to stay, Plaintiff had not yet been transferred to Utah and thus expected to be “extradited back to his home state of Utah at any point moving forward.” Id. As stated earlier, Plaintiff is now incarcerated in Utah.

Other than the vague allegation that Plaintiff’s “ability to litigate will be impossible due to a state of zero resources,” id., Plaintiff offers no justification for the requested stay. There is no evidence supporting Plaintiff’s claim that litigating from the Utah State Correctional Facility will be any more difficult than litigating from the Ada County Jail.

Therefore, the Court finds no reason to stay this case, and Plaintiff’s Motion for Stay of Further Proceedings will be denied. If Plaintiff needs additional time to respond to any motion or court order, he may file a motion for an extension of time.

The Motion to Stay Further Proceedings must be denied for the additional reason that—once again—Plaintiff has violated the Court’s order permitting a party only three pending motions at any given time. ORDER IT IS ORDERED: 1. Plaintiff’s “Motion Requesting Order... to Grant Plaintiff Printing Access” (Dkt. 30) is DENIED AS MOOT. 2. Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel (Dkt.

32) is DENIED AS MOOT. 3. Plaintiff’s Motion to Stay the Discovery Schedule (Dkt. 31) is DENIED. 4. Plaintiff’s Motion to Stay Further Proceedings (Dkt. 49) is DENIED on the merits and as violative of the Court’s previous order. a DATED: January 14, 2026 Is. “#8/ Honorable Debora K. Grasham RICE O) United States Magistrate Judge MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER - 5