

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Jakubowski v. Clendenin

Jakubowski · No. 1:23-CV-00897 JLT EPG (PC) · Decided March 27, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California orders the parties to submit statements addressing scheduling and discovery matters within 30 days of service. The order specifies required information concerning claims and defenses, witnesses, documents, experts, settlement conferences, exhaustion, investigations, recordings, and defendant identification issues.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	United States Magistrate Judge
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	March 27, 2025
DOCKET	1:23-CV-00897 JLT EPG (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After screening the prisoner civil-rights complaint and allowing the action to proceed, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss and issued an order requiring the parties to submit scheduling and discovery statements.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What scheduling and discovery information must the parties provide before the court schedules the prisoner civil-rights action?

KEY QUOTATIONS

“[P]roper exhaustion improves the quality of those prisoner suits that are eventually filed because proper exhaustion often results in the creation of an administrative record that is helpful to the court. When a grievance is filed shortly after the event giving rise to the grievance, witnesses can be identified and questioned while memories are still fresh, and evidence can be gathered and preserved.” (at 2 n.1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

David Jakubowski brought a prisoner civil-rights action against Stephanie Clendenin and other defendants concerning alleged events described in his complaint. The court's order indicates that the complaint had been screened, the action was proceeding, and defendants' motion to dismiss had been denied. The order references potential discovery concerning exhaustion, institutional records, investigations, witness statements, video recordings, photographs, and the identity of the individuals responsible for the alleged actions.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court screened Plaintiff's complaint and ordered the case to proceed. Defendants' motion to dismiss was denied, and their answer was due under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(a)(4)(A). Before scheduling the case, the court required each party to file a scheduling and discovery statement within thirty days of service of the order.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Woodford v. Ngo, 548 U.S. 81, 94-95 (2006)