

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**

DAVID HAMILTON,

No. 2:13-CV-1143-MCE-CMK-P

Plaintiff,

vs.

ORDER

K. SUTTERFIELD, et al.,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the court is plaintiff’s motion to compel (Doc. 54).

Plaintiff seeks an order compelling defendants to provide further responses to discovery requests. As an initial matter, the court finds that the motion is procedurally defective. Pursuant to the court’s January 17, 2018, scheduling order, motions to compel must comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37. Rule 37(a)(1) requires the moving party to certify that a good faith effort has been made to meet and confer regarding the discovery dispute. In this case, plaintiff’s motion contains no such certification or otherwise indicates any efforts to meet and confer with defendants’ counsel. For this reason alone, plaintiff’s motion will be denied.

///

1                    Additionally, plaintiff's motion fails to inform the court how defendants'  
2 responses to his discovery requests are inadequate. In particular, plaintiff has not provided a  
3 copy of the discovery and responses at issue or any argument specific to each such request and  
4 response as to why it is inadequate and further responses should be compelled. For this added  
5 reason, plaintiff's motion will be denied.

6                    Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to compel (Doc.  
7 54) is denied.

8  
9                    DATED: August 9, 2018

10                      
11                    **CRAIG M. KELLISON**  
12                    UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE