

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

MAURICE W. SMITH,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	CASE NO. 3:13CV502 (RNC)
	:	
GREATER NEW HAVEN TRANSIT,	:	
DISTRICT, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

ORDER

On October 23, 2013, the defendants filed their version of the Report of Parties' Planning Conference pursuant to Rule 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure ("Rule 26(f) report"). (Doc. #19.) According to defendants, the plaintiff failed to initiate a case planning conference, as required by Local Civil Rule 26(f)(1) ("The conference shall be initiated by the plaintiff and may be conducted by telephone.") The defendants further state that the plaintiff also failed to cooperate with defense counsel's efforts to hold a planning conference and to prepare the required report. As a result, the defendants filed the instant proposed report without the plaintiff's input or participation.

The Rule 26(f) report is a critical filing in the case. The pro se plaintiff and defense counsel are required to confer with each other at some length in order to prepare a thorough Rule 26(f) Report. The report should contain the parties' proposed date for the completion of discovery. All other dates in the scheduling order are based on the discovery deadline.

The plaintiff is advised that pro se parties are not excused from abiding by the rules of civil procedure.

A scheduling order will issue separately.

SO ORDERED at Hartford, Connecticut this 14th day of November, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Donna F. Martinez  
United States Magistrate Judge