

faith effort to resolve the dispute and has not attached copies of the discovery requests. Instead, he reiterates his demand for all of the documents originally requested. Thus, the plaintiff's motion to compel is denied.

In addition, the defendants explain in their opposition papers how the plaintiff can review the videotape of the incident and have provided the applicable versions of Administrative Directives. They repeat their argument that they need not provide a copy of the plaintiff's medical file since 2004.

Rule 34(a), Fed. R. Civ. P., permits any party to serve a request that documents be produced for inspection and copying. The rule does not require that copies of all requested documents be provided to the requesting party at the expense of the providing party. See 7 Moore's Federal Practice § 34.13[5] at 34-92 (2011) (citing Clever View Investments, Ltd. v. Oshatz, 233 F.R.D. 393, 394 (S.D.N.Y. 2006) (producing party bears cost of making documents available for inspection and copying but reproduction is not necessarily required)). Thus, the defendants are not required to assume the cost of copying the plaintiff's entire medical file for the last eight years.

The plaintiff's motion to compel [Doc. #49] is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED at Hartford, Connecticut this 24th day of August
2012.

/s/ Thomas P. Smith
Thomas P. Smith
United States Magistrate Judge