

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Rood v. Secretary of CDCR

Rood · No. 1:22-cv-00449-SAB (PC) · Decided April 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California denied Plaintiff Colton James Rood’s motion to stay proceedings in his § 1983 action against correctional officials. The court granted him an additional thirty days to respond to the defendant’s pending motions for summary judgment, to compel discovery responses, and to stay merits-based discovery, and directed the Clerk to resend those filings and a prior 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	April 10, 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 action, moved to stay the proceedings while the defendant's motions for summary judgment and to compel were pending.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court has broad discretion to stay proceedings as an incident to its power to control its docket, and the party seeking a stay bears the burden of establishing the need for it.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Colton James Rood v. Secretary of CDCR, et al.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- discovery dispute
- summary judgment
- prisoners rights
- section 1983

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff established sufficient grounds for a stay of the entire proceedings.
2. Whether Plaintiff should receive additional time to respond to Defendant's pending motions despite denial of a stay.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff failed to meet his burden of establishing the need for a stay, so the motion to stay the proceedings was denied.
2. Although the court denied a stay, it granted Plaintiff thirty days from service of the order to respond to Defendant's pending motions and directed the Clerk to resend the relevant filings.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The district court “has broad discretion to stay proceedings as an incident to its power to control its own docket.”” (at 1)

“The party seeking the stay bears the burden of establishing the need to stay the action.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff stated that his receipt of mail had been interrupted because he had been released from custody and that discovery requests had been returned as unsent. He also reported having undergone recent thumb surgery. The court found that Plaintiff had not shown that a stay was necessary to address the pending exhaustion-based summary-judgment motion or that his medical condition required a stay of the entire proceedings.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action proceeded against Defendant E. Carrillo on claims of deliberate indifference and retaliation. Defendant filed a motion for summary judgment based on failure to exhaust administrative remedies and a motion to compel discovery responses. After the court separately granted a stay of merits-based discovery, Plaintiff moved to stay the entire proceedings. The court denied that motion, granted Plaintiff an additional thirty days to respond to the pending motions, and directed the Clerk to resend copies of the motions and a prior order.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Clinton v. Jones, 520 U.S. 681, 706, 708 (1997)
- Landis v. N. Am. Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-california-united-states-district-court-for/2025/rood-v-secretary-of-cdcr-s0oxcko0>