

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

7 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8  
9 SAMMY ZAMARO, CASE NO. 1:09-cv-00580-SKO PC

10 Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING MOTION TO COMPEL

11 v. (Doc. 38)

12 G. MOONGA, et al.,

13 Defendants.

14  
15 Plaintiff Sammy Zamaro (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma  
16 pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On August 23, 2010, Plaintiff filed  
17 a motion to compel. (Doc. #38.) Defendants filed an opposition to Plaintiff’s motion to compel on  
18 September 9, 2010. (Doc. #39.)

19 Plaintiff’s motion to compel fails to identify how Defendants’ responses to Plaintiff’s  
20 discovery requests are inadequate. Plaintiff’s motion only states that he served a set of document  
21 production requests, a set of requests for admissions, and a set of interrogatories on Defendants.  
22 Plaintiff vaguely contends that Defendants “failed to comply fully with Plaintiffs[sic] request.”  
23 (Plaintiffs[sic] Motion to Compel 1, ECF No. 38.) Plaintiff further contends that Defendants did not  
24 produce any documents in response to Plaintiff’s requests and objected to all of the requests for  
25 admissions and requests for production of documents.

26 When an opposing party objects to a discovery request, a motion to compel must demonstrate  
27 why the objections are improper. In his motion to compel, Plaintiff must set forth his requests and  
28 Defendants’ responses and present specific arguments in support of his contention that Defendants’

1 responses are inadequate. Although Plaintiff has attached copies of his requests and Defendants' 2 responses to his motion, Plaintiff has failed to present any argument as to how Defendants' responses 3 are inadequate. The Court will not review each discovery request and each response and attempt to 4 determine whether each response is sufficient. Further, it would impose an undue burden on the 5 Defendants to require them to file an opposition that defends each response and the objections they 6 have raised in response to Plaintiff's discovery requests.

7 Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate how Defendants' responses are inadequate or why the 8 objections to Plaintiff's discovery requests are improper. Accordingly, it is HEREBY ORDERED 9 that Plaintiff's motion to compel is DENIED.

10  
11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: October 25, 2010

13 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto  
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE