

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

CHRISTOPHER MIKE DARAZS, :
Plaintiff, :
v. : Case No. 3:11-cv-2019 (AVC)
JON BRIGHTHAUPT, et al., :
Defendants. :

RULING AND ORDER

The defendants seek a court order directing the plaintiff to answer deposition questions. In response, the plaintiff asks the court to defer his deposition until counsel has been appointed.

The court denied the plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel on August 24, 2012. The deposition was approved in April 2012. Since that time, the plaintiff has not retained counsel to assist him in the deposition. In fact, in his motion for appointment of counsel, filed in July 2012, he stated that he had made no efforts to obtain counsel on his own. The plaintiff has no constitutional right to counsel in a civil matter. The plaintiff's motion for extension of time [Doc. #18] is DENIED.

The defendants' motion to compel the plaintiff to respond to deposition questions [Doc. #17] is GRANTED. The defendants are directed to re-notice the deposition. The plaintiff is cautioned

that if he fails to participate fully in the deposition, the defendants may file a motion to dismiss this action. See Salahuddin v. Harris, 782 F.2d 1127, 1133 (2d Cir. 1986) (noting that dismissal may be used as a sanction if deponent acts wilfully or in bad faith).

SO ORDERED this 19th day of September, 2012 at Hartford, Connecticut.

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