

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

SYLESTER WILLIAMS,	)	Case No.: 1:10-cv-01250-SAB (PC)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
v.	)	TO COMPEL WITHOUT PREJUDICE
	)	
SERGEANT R. ANDERSON, et al.,	)	[ECF No. 47]
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff Sylester Williams is appearing pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Now pending before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion to compel, filed March 13, 2014.

Plaintiff contends that defense counsel has failed to respond to Plaintiff’s interrogatories and “discovery documents.” Plaintiff’s motion shall be denied.

Plaintiff’s motion is deficient. As Plaintiff was advised in the Court’s First Informational Order issued July 14, 2010, if a “response to discovery is unsatisfactory, the party seeking discovery may file a motion to compel discovery, including a copy of the discovery propounded and the response thereto.” (ECF No. 3 at 5:2-4.) In this instance, Plaintiff has failed to attach a copy of the

///  
///  
///

1 discovery propounded on the defendants for which he claims no response has been submitted.  
2 Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion to compel is DENIED without prejudice.

3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 18, 2014

  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE