

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM ROUSER,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-06-1527 LKK GGH P

vs.

JAMES E. TILTON, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

On December 31, 2008, plaintiff filed a request for sanctions. In this motion, plaintiff alleges that defendants were untruthful in responses to interrogatories. For example, plaintiff alleges that defendants' claim that they do not know the meaning of "side room" and "there to watch" is false. Plaintiff also objects that in a response to a request for admissions, defendant Hannigan falsely stated that he did not know what the word altar means. As relief, plaintiff seeks an order directing defendants to respond to his discovery requests. Based on this request, the court construes plaintiff's motion for sanctions as a motion to compel.

Attached to the motion are approximately 72 pages of discovery responses. In his motion, plaintiff does not identify which specific responses he is objecting to. The court will not comb through these 72 pages of discovery responses for plaintiff in order to determine which responses he may be objecting to. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion is denied because it is not well

