

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Roderico LeCount Yates v. Jaymie Cabrera

Yates · No. 2:23-cv-02008-CDS-NJK · Decided December 2, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Nevada denied Plaintiff Roderico LeCount Yates’s motion to compel discovery. The court found that production responses had been provided, rendering that portion moot, and concluded that interrogatories concerning prior complaints and disciplinary actions and a request for admission about delayed medication were not relevant or discoverable.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	December 2, 2025
DOCKET	2:23-cv-02008-CDS-NJK
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to compel discovery in a civil-rights action alleging deliberate indifference to medical needs. The district court resolved the motion without a hearing and denied it.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court has broad discretion to permit or deny discovery. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a), a party may move to compel discovery, and the party seeking to avoid discovery bears the burden of showing why the discovery should not be permitted.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district-court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Roderico LeCount Yates v. Jaymie Cabrera

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil rights
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Civil rights litigation
- Prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's motion to compel responses to requests for production should be granted when Defendant represented that the responses had been provided.
2. Whether information concerning Defendant's past complaints and disciplinary actions was relevant and discoverable in this deliberate-indifference action.
3. Whether an admission concerning the frequency of late medication delivery at High Desert State Prison was relevant and discoverable.

HOLDINGS

1. The requests for production portion of the motion to compel was denied as moot because Defendant represented that responses had been provided.
2. Information concerning Defendant's past complaints and disciplinary actions was not relevant and discoverable in this action alleging deliberate indifference to medical needs.
3. The request for an admission that medicine is frequently provided late at High Desert State Prison was not relevant and discoverable in this case.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"[B]road discretion is vested in the trial court to permit or deny discovery." (at 1)

"Defense counsel must be mindful in the future of the prohibition to citing unpublished Ninth Circuit authority issued before 2007." (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action alleges deliberate indifference to medical needs. Plaintiff sought production responses, interrogatory answers concerning Defendant's past complaints and disciplinary actions, and an admission that medicine is frequently provided late at High Desert State Prison. Defendant represented that responses to the production requests had been provided belatedly.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a motion to compel. Defendant responded, but Plaintiff filed no reply. Defendant represented that responses to the requests for production had been provided belatedly. The court denied the requests for production as moot and denied the remaining discovery requests as irrelevant and not discoverable.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Hallett v. Morgan, 296 F.3d 732, 751 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Crawford-El v. Britton, 523 U.S. 574, 598 (1998)
- V5 Techs. v. Switch, Ltd., 334 F.R.D. 306, 309 (D. Nev. 2019)

- Blankenship v. Hearst Corp., 519 F.2d 418, 429 (9th Cir. 1975)
- Blaisdell v. Frappiea, 729 F.3d 1237, 1241 (9th Cir. 2013)
- Israel v. Carter, 2022 WL 3691442, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 25, 2022)

OPINION

Yates

PER CURIAM.

1 2

3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 Roderico LeCount Yates, 6 Case No. 2:23-cv-02008-CDS-NJK Plaintiff, 7 Order v. 8 [Docket
No. 65] Jaymie Cabrera, 9 Defendants. 10 11 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to
compel. Docket No. 65.1 Defendant 12 filed a response. Docket No. 66. No reply was filed. The
motion is properly resolved without a 13 hearing. See Local Rule 78-1.

14 I. STANDARD

15 "[B]road discretion is vested in the trial court to permit or deny discovery." Hallett v. 16
Morgan, 296 F.3d 732, 751 (9th Cir. 2002); see also Crawford-El v. Britton, 523 U.S. 574, 598 17
(1998). When a party fails to provide discovery, the requesting party may move to compel it. Fed.
18 R. Civ. P. 37(a). The party seeking to avoid discovery bears the burden of showing why the 19
discovery should not be permitted. V5 Techs. v. Switch, Ltd., 334 F.R.D. 306, 309 (D. Nev. 2019)
20 (citing Blankenship v. Hearst Corp., 519 F.2d 418, 429 (9th Cir. 1975)).

21 II. ANALYSIS

22 A. Requests for Production 23 Defendant represents that responses to Plaintiff's requests for
production have now been 24 made (in belated fashion). See Docket No. 66 at 4. Based on these
representations, this aspect of 25 the motion to compel will be denied as moot. 26 27 1 The Court
liberally construes the filings of pro se litigants, particularly those who are 28 prisoners bringing
civil rights claims. Blaisdell v. Frappiea, 729 F.3d 1237, 1241 (9th Cir. 2013). 1 B. Interrogatories
5 and 6 2 These interrogatories seek information as to past complaints and disciplinary actions 3],
against Defendant. See Docket No. 65 at 6-9. Such requests are not relevant and discoverable in 4]
this case alleging deliberate indifference to medical needs. See, e.g., Israel v. Carter, 2022 WL 5]
3691442, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 25, 2022) (collecting cases).* This aspect of the motion to compel
6] will be denied. 7 Cc. Request for Admission 3 8 This request seeks an admission that medicine
is frequently provided late at High Desert 9] State Prison. See Docket No. 65 at 10-11. As such
explained above, such information is not relevant and discoverable. See, e.g., Israel, 2022 WL
3691442, at *2. This aspect of the motion to compel will be denied.

12) 1. CONCLUSION

13 For the reasons discussed above, the Court DENIES Plaintiffs motion to compel. 14 IT IS SO
ORDERED. 15 Dated: December 2, 2025 16 Nancy e 18 United States Magistrate Judge 19 20 21

22 23 24 25 26 27), ————— 2 Defense counsel must be mindful in the future of the prohibition to citing unpublished 28] Ninth Circuit authority issued before 2007. See 9th Cir. R. 36-3; but see Docket No. 66 at 6.

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-nevada-united-states-district-court-for-the-district/2025/roderico-lecount-yates-v-jaymie-cabrera-xm70wsgt>