Samuel et al v. Hartford et al Doc. 35

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

AUGUSTUS SAMUEL, et al., Plaintiff,

v. CASE NO: 3:10cv635(CFD)

CITY OF HARTFORD, et al., Defendants.

RULING AND ORDER

The plaintiff moves for sanctions against the defendants for failure to comply with disclosure requests and requirements pursuant to Rule 26, Fed. R. Civ. P. The defendants object on the ground that Rule 26 does not apply in pro se prisoner cases.

Rule 26(a)(1)(B)(iv) provides that cases filed without an attorney by a person in the custody of a state are exempt from the initial disclosure requirements. The plaintiff is not represented and is in the custody of the State of Connecticut. Thus, the Rule 26 initial disclosure requirements do not apply in this case. Plaintiff's motion [doc. #31] for sanctions for failure to comply with those requirements is DENIED.

The Court notes that the period for discovery has been extended until May 21, 2011. The defendants are directed to consider the discovery request attached to the plaintiff's request for a Rule 26(f) conference, as a request for production of documents served in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil

Procedure and to respond to the request.

SO ORDERED at Hartford, Connecticut this 18th day of April 2011.

/s/ Thomas P. Smith

Thomas P. Smith
United States Magistrate Judge