

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Millard Wayne Bakers, Jr. v. R. Shahbazian

Bakers v. Shahbazian · No. 1:24-CV-01279-HBK · Decided August 18, 2025

SUMMARY

This document is a Case Management Scheduling Order issued in Baker v. Shahbazian by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. It establishes limits and procedures for written discovery and depositions and sets deadlines for exhaustion challenges, non-expert discovery, settlement reporting, and dispositive motions. The order is dated August 18, 2025, and was issued by Magistrate Judge Helena M. Barch-Kuchta.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Helena M. Barch-Kuchta
DECIDED	August 18, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-CV-01279-HBK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court issued a case management and scheduling order in a prisoner civil-rights action, establishing discovery procedures, deadlines, motion limits, and future case-management dates.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Millard Wayne Bakers, Jr. v. R. Shahbazian

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- prisoners rights
- section 1983
- sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- prisoner civil rights litigation
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What discovery limits, response deadlines, and procedures should govern the action?

2. What deadlines should govern exhaustion-based motions, completion of nonexpert discovery, settlement reporting, and dispositive motions?
3. What procedures apply to depositions of incarcerated parties or witnesses and to motions to compel?

HOLDINGS

1. Absent leave of court, each party is limited to 15 interrogatories, 15 requests for admission, and 15 requests for production, and responses to written discovery are due within 45 days after service.
2. The parties must meet and confer in good faith before filing a discovery motion, and a motion to compel must be filed promptly and no later than 14 days before the nonexpert discovery deadline; failure to timely move to compel waives objections to discovery.
3. Defendants may depose the plaintiff or another witness confined in prison under Rule 30(a)(2)(B) if they provide at least 14 days' notice, and depositions may be conducted by videoconference under Rule 30(b)(4).
4. The deadlines for challenging exhaustion, completing nonexpert discovery, reporting on settlement potential, and filing pretrial dispositive motions are November 18, 2025; May 18, 2026; June 18, 2026; and August 18, 2026, respectively.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action is brought by an incarcerated plaintiff against R. Shahbazian and is identified as a prisoner civil-rights case under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court addressed the case at the scheduling stage and did not resolve the merits of the civil-rights claims. The order specifically accounted for discovery involving an incarcerated plaintiff and depositions of witnesses confined in prison.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a prisoner civil-rights action in the Eastern District of California. The court entered this scheduling order under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 1, 16, and 26 through 36. The order set deadlines for responding to the operative complaint, exhaustion-based motions, nonexpert discovery, settlement reporting, and dispositive motions.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Allen v. Woodford, 2007 WL 309945, at *2 (E.D. Cal. 2007)