

1 Plaintiff did not serve a response to Defendant's discovery requests, and on January 8, 2014,
2 Defendant sent Plaintiff a letter requesting a response no later than January 23, 2014. (ECF No. 19,
3 Motion, Ex. 3.) Plaintiff did not respond to the letter. (ECF No. 19, Motion, Decl. of Lawrence
4 Braag, at ¶ 4.)

5 Defendant seeks an order compelling Plaintiff to respond to his interrogatories and request for
6 production of documents, without objection.

7 Plaintiff was obligated to respond to Defendant's interrogatories and request for production of
8 documents. Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(b), 34(b)(2). Plaintiff failed to serve a response and he failed to file an
9 opposition to Defendant's motion to compel. Accordingly, Defendant's motion to compel shall be
10 GRANTED. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(3)(B). Plaintiff will be directed to file a response to the
11 interrogatories and production of documents, without objection, within thirty days from the date of
12 service of this order.¹

13 **II.**
14 **ORDER**

15 Based on the foregoing,

16 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 17 1. Defendant's motion to compel is GRANTED; and
- 18 2. Within thirty (30) days from the date of service of this order, Plaintiff shall serve
19 responses to Defendant's discovery requests, without objection.

20
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: April 7, 2014

23 
24 _____
25 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

26 _____
27 ¹ Failure to timely object to discovery requests constitutes a waiver of objections. Richmark Corp. v. Timber Falling
28 Consultants, 959 F.2d 1468, 1473 (9th Cir. 1992); Davis v. Fendler, 650 F.2d 1154, 1160 (9th Cir. 1981); Woods v. Kraft
Foods, Inc., No. CV F 05-1587 LJO, 2006 WL 2724096, *1-2 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 22, 2006).