Rose v. Lawlor et al Doc. 33

ELECTRONIC ORDER ON PENDING MOTIONS IN ROSE V. LAWLOR ET AL, 13 CV 1694 (AVC)

11/30/15 – On November 4, 2015, the <u>pro se</u> plaintiff filed the pending Motion to Compel (Dkt. #31), as to which defendants filed their Motion for Telephone Conference (Dkt. #32) the next day.

As defendants explain (Dkt. #32, at 2), plaintiff's motion is "premature, as the parties have not attempted to confer in good faith about . . . defendants' objections to discovery. . . ." For those same reasons, defendants' motion similarly is premature. A telephonic discovery conference with the Court is a last resort, not a first one.

Accordingly, both motions (Dkts. ##31-32) are <u>denied without prejudice to renew, after</u> the pro se plaintiff and defense counsel attempt to confer in good faith with each other in an attempt to resolve, or at least narrow, their discovery disputes.