UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

OSCAR ANDERSON,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	CASE NO. 3:13-cv-425(AVC)(TPS)
	:	
LEO C. ARNONE, et al.,	:	
Defendants.	:	

RULING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL [Doc. #29]

On May 9, the plaintiff filed a Motion for Default. Doc. #29. On May 29, 2014, the Court denied the motion for default, and determined that the motion should be construed as a motion to compel. Doc. #35. The remaining defendant, Captain Anita Hardy, has responded to the motion to compel. For the reasons that follow, the motion is denied.

Motions to compel are governed by Rule 37 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and District of Connecticut Local Civil Rule 37. The local rule requires that, before filing a motion to compel, the moving party must confer with opposing counsel in a good faith effort to resolve the dispute. The purpose of this rule is to encourage the parties to resolve discovery disputes without court intervention. See Hanton v. Price, No. 3:04cv473(CFD), 2006 WL 581204, at *1 (D. Conn. Mar. 8, 2006). If discussions are not successful, the party moving to compel must submit an affidavit certifying the attempted resolution and specifying which issues

were resolved and which remain. In addition, Local Rule 37(b)1

requires that the moving party file a memorandum stating the

precise nature of the case, listing each item of discovery sought

and explaining why the item should be allowed. Further, copies of

the discovery requests must be included as exhibits.

Although the plaintiff attaches a copy of the interrogatories

to his motion, he only states that the defendant did not respond

within thirty days. He does not indicate that he made any attempt

to resolve this issue before seeking court involvement, and has not

filed the required memorandum.

The plaintiff's motion to compel [**Doc. #29**] is **DENIED.**

So ordered at Hartford, Connecticut, this 22nd day of July

2014.

/s/ Thomas P. Smith
THOMAS P. SMITH
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE