

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 09-cv-00224-MSK-MJW

SCOTT FIRTH,

Plaintiff,

v.

JONI SHOEMAKER,
PEGGY HEIL,
JOE STOMMEL,
BURL McCULLAR,
SAMUEL DUNLAP,
CHRISTINE TYLER,
DWIGHT MARTINEZ,
PAT MOSHURE,
JACULYN MAUS,
LENNY WOODSON, and
TINA VALDEZ,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

Entered by Magistrate Judge Michael J. Watanabe

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Plaintiff's Follow Up Motion to Compel Production of Documents and Interrogatories (**Docket No. 102**) is granted in part with respect to Request for Production Nos. 5 and 8 as set forth below and is denied in all other respects. Defendants shall respond to Request for Production Nos. 5 and 8 as set forth below on or before December 15, 2010.

Request for Production No. 1: Defendants need not produce the plaintiff's entire CODC inmate file because the plaintiff's request is overly broad.

Request for Production No. 4 - Defendants need not respond because plaintiff's request is vague, overly broad, and unduly burdensome.

Request for Production Nos. 2, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, and 19 - Defendants need not respond because the requests seek information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Request for Production No. 5 - Defendants shall supplement their response with documents for the appropriate time period.

Request for Production No. 6 - Defendants have adequately responded and need not respond further.

Request for Production No. 8 - Defendants shall respond to this request.

Request for Production Nos. 12 and 13 - Defendants need not respond because the requests seek information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. In addition, these requests are vague, overly broad, and unduly burdensome.

Request for Production No. 15 - Defendants need not respond because the request seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. In addition, this request is overly broad and unduly burdensome.

Request for Production No. 18 - Defendants have responded that the documents provided are the only copies which could be located. Defendants need not respond further.

Interrogatory Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, and 17 - Defendant has adequately answered and need not respond further.

Interrogatory No. 12 - Defendant need not respond. This interrogatory is vague and seems to call for a legal conclusion.

Date: November 30, 2010
