

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 13-cv-00556-PAB-MJW

IVETTE T. ECHENIQUE,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

GOODWILL INDUSTRIES OF DENVER,

Defendant(s).

MINUTE ORDER

Entered by Magistrate Judge Michael J. Watanabe

It is hereby ORDERED that Defendant's Motion to Compel Responses to Defendant's First Set of Discovery (docket no. 49) is GRANTED.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that the Pro Se Plaintiff shall provide to Defendant responses to Defendant's First Set of Discovery on or before December 30, 2013. Each party shall pay their own attorney fees and costs for this motion.

The Pro Se Plaintiff has failed to file any timely response to the subject motion (docket no. 49), and this court deems the motion confessed. 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); People v. Carter, 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. Gibson v. City of Cripple Creek, 48 F.3d 1231 (10th Cir. 1995).

Date: December 5, 2013
