WO

2

1

4

5

6

7

8

10

9 Bobby S Thompson,

Plaintiff,

Joseph M Arpaio, et al.,

Defendants.

11 v.

12

13 14

15

16

18

17

1920

2122

23

2425

2627

28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

No. CV-16-03902-PHX-JAT (ESW)

ORDER

Plaintiff Bobby S. Thompson, who is confined in the Arizona State Prison, Whetstone Unit, in Tucson, Arizona, filed a pro se civil rights Second Amended Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Doc. 31). The Court ordered Defendants Maricopa County to answer Count One of the Second Amended Complaint, Defendant DO B2230 to answer the retaliation claim in Count Two of the Second Amended Complaint that is based on DO B2230's alleged issuance of a Disciplinary Report after Plaintiff submitted a grievance, and Defendant DO B2584 to answer Count Three of the Second Amended Complaint (Doc. 33). Defendants filed their Answer on February 20, 2018. The Court issued its Scheduling Order (Doc. 38) and discovery is ongoing.

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's "Motion for an Order Compelling Discovery" (Doc. 54). Plaintiff seeks an order compelling Defendants to answer fully interrogatories, produce documents, and pay Plaintiff \$500 in expenses for obtaining the order. As Defendants note in their "Response In Opposition To Plaintiff's Motion For

An Order Compelling Discovery [Doc. 54]" (Doc. 55), Plaintiff failed to comply with the Court's Scheduling Order (Doc. 38 at 3) and LRCiv 7.2(j) prior to filing his motion regarding discovery matters. In addition, Defendants indicate that they have responded to all Plaintiff's discovery requests in a timely manner, rendering the issues raised by Plaintiff moot. Plaintiff did not file a reply to Defendants' Response.

The Court finds that Plaintiff failed to attempt to resolve the discovery dispute through personal consultation and sincere efforts as required by the Court's Order (Doc. 38 at 3) and LRCiv 7.2 (j). The Court further finds that the issues raised by Plaintiff are moot as Defendants have timely produced all the discovery requested by Plaintiff.

For the reasons set forth herein,

IT IS ORDERED denying Plaintiff's "Motion for an Order Compelling Discovery" (Doc. 54).

Dated this 1st day of June, 2018.

Honorable Eileen S. Willett United States Magistrate Judge