1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	WILLIAM ROUSER,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-06-1527 LKK GGH P
12	VS.
13	JAMES E. TILTON, et al.,
14	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>
15	/
16	On December 31, 2008, plaintiff filed a request for sanctions. In this motion,
17	plaintiff alleges that defendants were untruthful in responses to interrogatories. For example,
18	plaintiff alleges that defendants' claim that they do not know the meaning of "side room" and
19	"there to watch" is false. Plaintiff also objects that in a response to a request for admissions,
20	defendant Hannigan falsely stated that he did not know what the word altar means. As relief,
21	plaintiff seeks an order directing defendants to respond to his discovery requests. Based on this
22	request, the court construes plaintiff's motion for sanctions as a motion to compel.
23	Attached to the motion are approximately 72 pages of discovery responses. In his
24	motion, plaintiff does not identify which specific responses he is objecting to. The court will not
25	comb through these 72 pages of discovery responses for plaintiff in order to determine which
26	responses he may be objecting to. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion is denied because it is not well
	1

1	supported.
1 2	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's December 31, 2008,
2	request for sanctions (no. 61), construed as a motion to compel, is denied.
3 4	DATED: January 28, 2009
т 5	/s/ Gregory G. Hollows
6	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
0 7	UNITED STATES MADISTRATE JUDGE
8	
9	rou1527.ord
10	1001527.010
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
	2