

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
Magistrate Judge Boyd N. Boland

Civil Action No. 08-cv-01023-MSK-BNB

JEREMY V. PINSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

SARA REVELL,
ROBERT PACHECO,
MERRY WILNER,
DELBERT SAUERS,
D. J. HARMON,
MICHAEL HENDERSON,
J. VIGIL, and
J. McKINNEY,

Defendants.

ORDER

This matter is before me on the plaintiff's **Motion for Order Concerning Hearing** [Doc. #89, filed 2/3/2009] (the "Motion"). The Motion is DENIED.

I have set a hearing on two discovery motions filed by the plaintiff. The plaintiff seeks an order "requesting the presence of Bureau of Prisons Lieutenant R. McCollough and C. Ratledge" at the hearing because "their testimony is relevant to the Motion before the court . . . and that these individuals have participated in the issues outlined in that Motion." The plaintiff does not specify what the proposed witnesses' testimony will be or why such testimony is relevant to the issues before the Court.

The plaintiff further requests that "the Court modify it's [sic] January 26, 2009 Minute Order reflecting the 2/11/2009 hearing is to be held via videoconference or teleconference for the

participation of Plaintiff at his place of confinement.” A request for a court order must “state with particularity the grounds for seeking the order” and “state the relief sought.” Fed.R.Civ.P. 7(b)(1)(B) and (C). This request is incomprehensible. It is impossible to determine what relief, if any, is sought or the grounds for relief.

IT IS ORDERED that the Motion is DENIED.

Dated February 9, 2009.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Boyd N. Boland
United States Magistrate Judge