VS.

10 AN

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

ANTHONY WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

No. 2: 09-cv-3160 KJN P

SULLIVAN, et al.,

Defendants.

<u>ORDER</u>

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel, with a civil rights complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On July 21, 2011, defendant Sullivan filed a motion to compel. Plaintiff failed to file an opposition. Accordingly, on September 2, 2011 plaintiff was ordered to show cause within twenty-one days for his failure to file an opposition. That time has passed and plaintiff did not respond to the show cause order.

In the motion to compel, defendant claims that plaintiff failed to provide responses to defendant's first set of interrogatories (nos. 10-10) propounded on April 12, 2011. The undersigned observes that several of defendant's interrogatories are contention interrogatories. "Contention interrogatories, directed to a pro se litigant, are rarely appropriate[.]" Nielsen v. Society of New York Hosp., 1988 WL 100197 at \* 2 (S.D.N.Y. 1988); see also Pobursky v. Madera County, 2009 WL 1582847 at \* 2 (E.D. Cal. 2009) ("The Court also

noted, and the long, tortured history of discovery in this action demonstrates, the futility of contention interrogatories, *especially* in actions involving pro se plaintiffs). Because plaintiff failed to respond to the interrogatories, the motion to compel and the order to show cause, the undersigned finds that plaintiff has waived any objection to the contention interrogatories.

The court deems plaintiff's failure to respond to the order to show cause to be a waiver of opposition.

## Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Defendant's motion to compel (Dkt. No. 36) is granted;
- 2. Within twenty-one days of the date of this order, plaintiff shall serve defendant with responses to interrogatories nos. 1-10 without any objections.

DATED: September 30, 2011

KENDALL J. NEWMAN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

will3160.com