

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| MARIUS MAYE, Plaintiff, | : | CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:07-CV-1690 (JCH) |
| | : | |
| v. | : | |
| | : | |
| RICARDO VARGAS, ET AL., Defendant. | : | JANUARY 13, 2011 |
| | : | |

ORDER RE: REQUEST FOR TRANSCRIPTS (Doc. No. 133)

The court hereby denies plaintiff’s Request for Transcripts (Doc. No. 133), without prejudice to renew. If plaintiff wishes to renew his request, he must articulate a “substantial question” in order for the court to waive the fees normally due for transcripts. See 28 U.S.C. 753(f). Specifically, plaintiff must explain (1) why the question he is raising on appeal is “reasonably debatable” and (2) why the transcripts are necessary for him to present an appeal. See Rossi v. W. Haven Bd. of Educ., No. 3:03CV1247, 2005 WL 850949, at *1 (D. Conn. Apr. 8, 2005).

The court may also consider the costs associated with providing transcripts to plaintiff. See Eldagher v. N.Y. Dep’t of Citywide Admin. Servs., No. 02 Civ. 9151, 2009 WL 1730977, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. June 18, 2009). To avoid any unnecessary expense, the court encourages plaintiff to explain the reason for each of the requested transcripts.

SO ORDERED.

Dated at Bridgeport, Connecticut this 13th day of January, 2011.

/s/ Janet C. Hall
Janet C. Hall
United States District Judge