

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

RICHARD CHARLES HANNA,
Plaintiff,
v.
DEPUTY BOEHM, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:12-cv-00501-AWI-SAB
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
TO COMPEL
(ECF No. 167)

On May 1, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel. Plaintiff’s motion to compel fails to comply with the Local Rules of the Eastern District of California. Pursuant to the Local Rule a motion regarding a discovery agreement is a noticed hearing held at least 21 days after the motion is filed. L.R. 251(a). Further, the Court will not hear a motion regarding a discovery dispute unless the parties have met and conferred to resolve their differences and have set forth the basis of the discovery agreement in a joint statement. L.R. 251(b). The requirements of the joint statement are set forth in Rule 251(c). Plaintiff is advised that even though he is proceeding pro se in this action he is required to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules in prosecuting this action.

Additionally, Plaintiff cannot merely identify the specific request for which he seeks a further response. As the moving party, Plaintiff bears the burden of informing the Court which discovery requests are the subject of his motion to compel and, for each disputed response, why

1 Defendant's objection is not justified. Plaintiff may not simply assert that he has served
2 discovery requests, that he is dissatisfied, and that he wants an order compelling responses. The
3 Court shall deny Plaintiff's motion on the ground that it is procedurally deficient. The denial
4 will be without prejudice to curing the deficiencies and re-filing the motion, within thirty days.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: May 4, 2015


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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