

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Beavers v. Hosey

Beavers · No. 1:21-cv-00650-HBK (PC) · Decided May 23, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California denied without prejudice Plaintiff Gary Lee Beavers’s motion to extend the discovery deadline because he failed to show good cause. The court deferred ruling on his motion to compel because he had not satisfied the meet-and-confer requirement, directing the parties to confer and, if necessary, file a joint statement regarding unresolved discovery disputes.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Helena M. Barch-Kuchta
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	May 23, 2025
DOCKET	1:21-cv-00650-HBK (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to extend the non-expert discovery deadline and to compel discovery in an ongoing prisoner civil-rights action. The court denied the extension motion without prejudice and deferred ruling on the motion to compel.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Whether good cause supported modification of the discovery deadline and scheduling order under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 6(b) and 16(b)(4); whether the motion to compel complied with the meet-and-confer requirement under Rule 37(a)(1) and Local Rule 251(b).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished trial-court order

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- summary judgment

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff showed good cause warranting an extension of the non-expert discovery deadline under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 6(b) and 16(b)(4).
2. Whether plaintiff's motion to compel was facially deficient because he failed to certify that he had met and conferred with defendant as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a)(1) and Local Rule 251(b).
3. Whether the court should defer ruling on the motion to compel to permit the parties to meet and confer and, if necessary, submit a joint statement.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff did not establish good cause for a 90-day extension of discovery because he failed to identify outstanding discovery requests or otherwise articulate a sufficient basis for the extension.
2. A motion to compel is facially deficient when the moving party fails to certify that the parties met or attempted to meet and confer before filing the motion.
3. The court deferred ruling on the motion to compel and directed the parties to meet and confer; if the dispute remained unresolved, they were required to file a joint statement addressing the remaining disputes.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Because Plaintiff has not set forth any good cause for the proposed extension, the Court will deny the discovery motion without prejudice.” (at 2)

“Because Plaintiff failed to comply with the meet and confer requirement before filing his motion to compel, the compel motion is facially deficient, and the Court may deny it on that basis.” (at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court had set May 29, 2025, as the deadline for completing non-expert discovery and required prompt motions to compel and a prior meet and confer. Plaintiff sought a 90-day extension, asserting that some defense discovery responses were nonresponsive and that he had not received defendant's February 18, 2025 discovery requests. He also moved to compel production of incident reports, personnel files, and witness information, but did not include a certification that he had met and conferred with defendant.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court's amended scheduling order required completion of non-expert discovery by May 29, 2025, and required the parties to meet and confer before filing discovery motions. Defendants Mendoza and Espinoza were dismissed after the court granted their exhaustion-based motion for summary judgment, leaving Officer Hosey as the remaining defendant. Plaintiff then moved for an extension and later moved to compel; the court denied the

extension for failure to show good cause and deferred the motion to compel because plaintiff had not certified that he met and conferred.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Palmer v. Crotty, 2010 WL 4279423, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 22, 2010)

OPINION

(PC) Beavers v. Hosey

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 GARY LEE BEAVERS, Case No. 1:21-cv-00650-HBK (PC) 12 Plaintiff, ORDER
DENYING PLAINTIFF’S

MOTION TO EXTEND DISCOVERY

13 v. WITHOUT PREJUDICE

14 OFFICER HOSEY, (Doc. No. 53) 15 Defendant. ORDER DEFERRING RULING ON
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO COMPEL

16 (Doc. No. 55) 17 18 19 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff Gary Lee Beaver’s Motion to
Extend Discovery filed

20 April 21, 2025. (Doc. No. 53, “discovery motion”). Plaintiff seeks a 90-day extension to the
21 May 29, 2025 discovery deadline. Plaintiff states the extension is necessary because “some” of
22 defense counsel’s discovery responses were non-responsive, including requests concerning 23
Officers Espinosa and Mendoza, and that he never received Defendant’s discovery requests sent
24 on February 18, 2025.¹ (Id.). 25 Defendant filed an opposition to the Motion on April 29, 2025.
(Doc. No. 54). 26 1 Defendant states that Plaintiff’s mail log reflects that he received and signed
for incoming mail from 27 defense counsel’s office on February 18 and 24, 2025, which is
consistent with when Defendant served the discovery request. (Doc. No. 54 at 7). To the extent
Plaintiff maintains he did not receive the requests, he 28 should contact defense counsel and
request a duplicate copy. 1 Defendants argue that Plaintiff fails to articulate good cause, fails to
show diligence, and 2 improperly seeks discovery from dismissed defendants. (Id.). Specifically,
Defendant asserts 3 that (1) any new discovery requests are untimely, (2) Plaintiff is not entitled to
discovery from 4 non-parties Espinosa and Mendoza, (3) Plaintiff failed to identify any
deficiencies in Defendant’s 5 responses, (4) Defendant propounded discovery requests on
February 18, 2025, but Plaintiff 6 failed to timely respond, and (5) defense counsel attempted to

meet and confer on April 14, 2025, 7 but Plaintiff refused to engage. (See generally, *id.*). Thus, Defendants oppose any further 8 extension to the deadline but, requests in the alternative if the Court grants an extension, that any 9 extension be limited to motions to compel and Plaintiff's deposition. (*Id.* at 2). 10 On May 12, 2025, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel discovery. (Doc. No. 55, "compel 11 motion"). Plaintiff moves to compel the production of certain information and various records, 12 including incident reports, personnel files, and witness information, arguing that Defendants had 13 improperly withheld relevant materials.² Plaintiff asserts that certain discovery requests were sent 14 to defendants, however, Plaintiff does not "expect them to comply." (*Id.*). Defendant's response 15 to the compel motion is not yet due.

16 BACKGROUND

17 On July 31, 2024, the Court entered an amended scheduling order directing the parties to 18 complete non-expert discovery by May 29, 2025, and advising that "Motions to compel should be 19 filed promptly after the non-receipt or receipt of the objectionable discovery; and, in all cases no 20 later than ten (10) days before the non-expert discovery deadline expires." (Doc. No. 34 at 3-4). 21 Further, the Court requires the parties to "meet and confer, via correspondence or 22 telephonically, to resolve any discovery dispute prior to filing any discovery motion." (*Id.* at 23 2 (emphasis original)). 24 On January 29, 2025, the Court granted Defendants Mendoza and Espinoza's exhaustion- 25 26 2 Upon review of Plaintiff's Motion to Compel, the Court notes that certain requests—such as those related to Officer Hosey's disciplinary history—may be relevant and unavailable by other means. However, 27 certain requests seeking broad institutional records regarding porter assignments and prison-wide violence may exceed the scope of permissible discovery. The Court has no information indicating whether Plaintiff 28 has previously propounded this specific discovery request. 1 based Motion for Summary Judgment, leaving Defendant Hosey as the only remaining 2 Defendant. (Doc. No. 45 at 19). On April 1, 2025, the Court denied Plaintiff's motion for 3 reconsideration of the January 29, 2025 Order. (Doc. No. 52).

4 ANALYSIS

5 With regards to Plaintiff's discovery motions, Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b) provides for extending 6 deadlines for good cause shown, if the request to extend time is made before the original time. 7 Additionally, Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4) permits a court to modify a scheduling order for good cause 8 shown and with the judge's consent. Plaintiff filed his motions prior to the previous filing 9 deadline. However, Plaintiff has not identified any discovery requests he has submitted to 10 Defendant that are pending a response or otherwise identify any outstanding discovery. See 11 *Palmer v. Crotty*, 2010 WL 4279423, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 22, 2010) (denying motion for 12 extension of discovery where plaintiff failed to articulate any good cause). Because Plaintiff has 13 not set forth any good cause for the proposed extension, the Court will deny the discovery motion 14 without prejudice. Should Plaintiff wish a further extension of the discovery deadlines he should 15 contact defense counsel and attempt to first obtain a stipulation for the extended time should he 16 be able to show good cause for a further extension of time. 17 With regards to the

motion to compel, fatal to the motion is Plaintiff's failure to include a 18 certification that he has meet and conferred with defendant prior to filing the motion. Under the 19 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and local rules of this Court, a party must confer or attempt to 20 confer with the opposing party to resolve a discovery dispute before filing a motion to compel. 21 Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1); see also Local Rule 251(b). See also Doc. No. 34 at 2-3 (appraising the 22 parties of the meet and confer requirement). Because Plaintiff failed to comply with the meet and 23 confer requirement before filing his motion to compel, the compel motion is facially deficient, 24 and the Court may deny it on that basis. 25 Nonetheless, in the interests of efficiency, the Court will defer ruling on the motion to 26 permit the parties to meet and confer telephonically to clarify and attempt to resolve the disputed 27 discovery issue before ruling on the motion. If the parties cannot fully resolve their discovery 28 disputes, they shall file a joint statement outlining the disputed discovery issues and their respective 1 | positions on each dispute. After reviewing the joint statement, the Court will, if necessary, schedule 2 | a telephonic hearing on the discovery dispute. 3 Accordingly, it is now ORDERED: 4 1. Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Discovery (Doc. No. 53) is DENIED without prejudice. 5 2. The Court defers ruling on Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (Doc. No. 55) and directs the 6 parties to meet and confer as set forth herein. 7 3. The parties shall telephonically meet and confer in good faith to attempt to resolve the 8 outstanding discovery dispute no later than June 16, 2025. 9 4. If the parties resolve their discovery disputes, they shall promptly file a notice with the 10 Court. 11 5. If the parties are not able to resolve their discovery dispute, they shall file a joint 12 statement, not to exceed six pages (three pages per party), outlining which items of 13 discovery remain in dispute no later than June 30, 2025. Not more than six pages in 14 exhibits (three pages per party) may be attached to the joint statement. 15 6. Upon review of the joint statement, the Court, if necessary, will schedule this matter 16 for a telephonic hearing on the discovery dispute. 17 7. Defendant is NOT required to file a separate response to the Motion to Compel. 18 Dated: _ May 23, 2025 Mihaw. Wh. foareh Zaskth

20 HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA

1 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

22 23 24 25 26 27 28