

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

LORI RODRIGUEZ

v.

NICHOLAS CALACE,
BERNAVIN ARMSTRONG and
BRIDGEPORT HOUSING AUTHORITY,

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CIV. NO. 3:07CV200 (WWE)

RULING ON DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

Lori Rodriguez brings this employment discrimination law suit against her employer, the Bridgeport Housing Authority ("BHA"); its Executive Director, Nicholas Calace, and her direct supervisor, Bernavin Armstrong.

On February 21, 2012, defendants' counsel contacted the Court, requesting a telephone conference to address plaintiff's failure to provide responses to defendants' December 2011 discovery requests. [Doc. #93]. A conference call was held on February 22, 2012. Defendants' counsel represented that, after he received no responses, counsel conferred and agreed that plaintiff would provide her responses by February 15, 2012. To date, no responses have been provided.

Despite the best efforts of plaintiff's counsel, he has been unable to get timely and complete responses to defendants' discovery requests from his client. Plaintiff is cautioned that failure to cooperate with her counsel and/or to meet court

ordered deadlines may expose her to sanctions, up to and including dismissal of the case. Plaintiff's counsel will provide his client with a copy of this order.

The Court will deem defendants' unanswered Requests to Admit admitted. Plaintiff has until Friday, March 2, 2012 to provide all outstanding discovery responses. If there are no further responsive documents, plaintiff will state so under oath. If defendants are not satisfied with plaintiff's responses, they may seek appropriate sanctions.

Written discovery will close on Friday, March 2, 2012, except for the on-going obligation to supplement.

This order does not modify the dates set forth in the parties' Joint Scheduling Order, approved by Judge Eginton on January 30, 2012. [Doc. #89].

Accordingly, defendant's oral Motion to Compel and for Sanctions **[Doc. #93]** is **GRANTED in part and DENIED in part**, consistent with this ruling and order. Defendants' counsel will contact the Court after March 2, 2012, to request additional relief if plaintiff fails to comply with this order.

This is not a recommended ruling. This is a discovery ruling and order which is reviewable pursuant to the "clearly erroneous" statutory standard of review. 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1) (A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), 6(e) and 72(a); and Rule 2 of the Local Rules for United States Magistrate Judges. As such, it

is an order of the Court unless reversed or modified by the district judge upon motion timely made.

SO ORDERED at Bridgeport this 22nd day of February 2012.

_____/s/_____
HOLLY B. FITZSIMMONS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE