IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 12-cv-00609-WYD-MJW

JILL COIT,

Plaintiff,

٧.

ARISTEDES ZAVARAS, Director of the Colorado Department of Corrections, et. al,

Defendants.

MINUTE ORDER

Entered by Magistrate Judge Michael J. Watanabe

It is hereby ORDERED that the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff's Motion to Change Deadline for Joinder of Parties/ Amendment to Pleading to Order Defendant to Provide Discovery [sic] (Docket No. 175) is DENIED for the following reasons. As to the relief sought in the subject motion (Docket No. 175) wherein the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff is objecting to Magistrate Judge Watanabe's Order (Docket No. 160) which gave Defendants up to and including February 8, 2013 to respond to Plaintiff's First Set of Discovery Requests (Docket No. 157), I find that if the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff disagreed with this Order (Docket No. 160), then she should have filed her written objection with Judge Daniel pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, which she did not do. Moreover, as to the relief sought in the subject motion (Docket No. 175) wherein the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff seeks an Order from this court to direct Defendants to respond to the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff's discovery, the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff has not complied with Fed. R. Civ. P. 37. The court cannot tell from this subject motion (Docket No. 175) which interrogatory, request for production of document or request for admission the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff suggests Defendants have not responded to. She has not attached her interrogatories, request for production of documents or request for admissions which are in dispute in the relief sought and any responses, if any, that she has received from the Defendants to such discovery requests.

Pro Se litigants must "comply with the fundamental requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil . . . Procedure." Odgen v. San Juan County, 32 F.3d 452, 455 (10th Cir. 1994). The fact that a party is appearing pro se does not relieve that individual from the obligation of complying with all applicable rules of the court. Nielson v. Price, 17 F.3d 1276, 1277 (10th Cir. 1994) (pro se plaintiffs are held to the same rules of procedure which apply to other litigants); Hall v. Doering, 997 F. Supp. 1464, 1468 (D. Kan. 1998);

<u>People v. Carter</u>, 678 F. Supp. 1484, 1490 (D. Colo. 1986). It is not the proper function of the district court to assume the role of advocate for the pro se litigant. <u>Gibson v. City of Cripple Creek</u>, 48 F.3d 1231 (10th Cir. 1995).

It is FURTHER ORDERED that the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff's Motion to Order The U.S. Marshall [sic] Service to Provide Documentation of Their Attempt to Serve Defendant Dussart (Docket No. 174) is GRANTED as follows. This court contacted the U.S. Marshal Service for the District of Colorado concerning service attempts on Defendant Dussart. The U.S. Marshal Service for the District of Colorado provided to this court a one page document which shows the attempts made to serve Defendant Dussart. This document has been previously filed with the court (Docket No. 112). The U.S. Marshal Service for the District of Colorado informed this court that this one page document is the only documentation they have concerning service attempts on Defendant Dussart. It is noted that the U.S. Marshal Service made five (5) separate attempts to serve Defendant Dussart. The court will provide to both the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff as well as to the Defendants a copy of such document from the U.S. Marshal for the District of Colorado showing five (5) separate service attempts upon Defendant Dussart.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff's Motion to Add Excerpts into Court of Defendant's Production of Narrative Under Discovery [sic] (Docket No. 176) is DENIED for the following reasons. In essence, the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff is attempting to introduce excerpts of this narrative into the record of court proceedings as some proof of her claims brought in her Amended Prisoner Complaint (Docket No. 20). The Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff cites no legal authority to support the relief sought. Moreover, the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff will be given an opportunity by Judge Daniel to present her evidence at trial in support of her claims brought within the Amended Prisoner Complaint (Docket No. 20), which is currently the operative pleading in this case. Further, this court has previously addressed the access issue for the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff to listen to the audio tapes in question in the Lowell Correctional Institution where the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff is currently being held. It is the court's understanding from previous hearings conducted in this case that arrangements have already been made for the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff to listen to such audio tapes and that, in fact, she has already listen to such audio tapes. As to the relief sought in this motion regarding ordering that the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff be immediately moved to Alaska, the Pro Se Incarcerated Plaintiff cites no legal authority or any factual basis for such relief within the subject motion (Docket No. 176).

Date: February 14, 2013

FILED UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DENVER, COLORADO DI

U.S. Department of Justice					PROCESS RECEIPT AND RETURN See Instructions for "Service of Process by the U.S. Marshal"						
United Sta	ites Marshals Se	rvice N	07 - 7 2			ructions for ' everse of this		e of Process by t	he U.S. N	1arshai"	j
	·	IEEE								70.00	
PLAINTIFF Jill Coit			EY H. CO	CLERK	COURT 12-cv-0(CASE NUN 1609-WYD-1	MBER MJW	#(71 <u>*</u> . 3	:
DEFENDANT Michael Dussart, et al.,					TYPE OF PROCESS S/C					t	
SERVE	NAME OF INDIVI CONDEMN Michael Dussart	DUAL, COM	PANY, CORP	ORATION,	ETC., T	O SERVE O	OR DE	SCRIPTION OF	PROPER	ety to	SEIZE OF
AT	ADDRESS (Street or RFD, Apartment No., City State and Zip Code) 423 Avondale Avenue, Avondale, CO 81022										
CENT MOTE	OF OF SERVICE OF	DV TO BEO	HECTED AT N	LANCE AND	ADDR	EGG DEI OV	U.	Number of proc	ness to be		
SEND NOTICE OF SERVICE COPY TO REQUESTER AT NAME AN Jill Coit - Prisoner No. 163936						ESS BELOV		ith this Form - 285		1	
Lowell Correctional Institution 11120 NW Gainesville Road Ocala, FL 34482-1479					1 			Number of parties to be served in this case			3
							Check for servi	ck for service on U.S.A.			
Signature of	•		sting service or	n behalf	_X_	PLAINTIFF	TI	ELEPHONE NU	MBER	DATE	
Signature of Attorney or other Originator requesting service on behalf of: s/A. García						PLAINTIFF	AINTIFF TELEPHONE NUI			R DATE	
Deputy Clerk			·.			EFENDANT)3-844-3433		8/21/20	
SPAC	E BELOW FO	R USE OI	F U.S. MA	RSHAL	ONLY	Y - DO N	OT V	WRITE BEI	LOW 1	THIS I	INE
				District to Serve	Signature of Authorized USM			USMS Deputy	Deputy or Clerk Date		
(Sign only fir.	st USM 285 if more 1 285 is submitted)				3 Tam E			Ilauton 8		86	21-12
I hereby certif the process de address indica	y and return that I scribed on the individual ted below.	have perso lual, company	onally served, , corporation,	have letc., at the a	legal evi ddress sl	dence of ser hown above	vice, or on t	have execu he individual, co	ted as sho mpany, e	own in "I tc., show	lemarks", n at the
	y certify and return t			individual,	compan	y, corporatio	n, etc.,	, named above (S	ee remar	ks below)
Name and titl	e of individual served	l (if not showi	n above)				residir	A person of suiting in the defenda			
Address (complete only if different than shown above)						D		of Service	Time		am pm
							Signat	ture of U.S. Mars	shal or De	puty	
Service Fee	Total Mileage Cha (including endeaver	~	Forwarding Fee	Total Ch	~ _	Advance D	Deposit	Amount owed Marshal or	to U.S.	Amount	of Refund
REMARKS:	deaver - 09-27 leaver - 69-27	ine of	30 5	- Ena	leave,	r 11-01.	-12	200830 e 0745 Returned	l un	ورورو	./.

PRIOR EDITIONS MAY BE USED

1. CLERK OF THE COURT

FORM USM-285 (Rev. 12/15/80)