

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

OMAR MILLER,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	CASE NO. 3:14cv766 (RNC)
	:	
MARK BUCHANAN,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

RULING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL

The plaintiff, who is self-represented, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging that the defendant, Dr. Mark Buchanan, was deliberately indifferent to the plaintiff's serious medical needs in violation of the Eighth Amendment. Pending before the court is the plaintiff's motion to compel.¹ (Doc. #36.) The court heard oral argument on June 6, 2017 and rules on the requests as follows:

A. Plaintiff's First Production Requests

1. Production Request 1 is granted. Defense counsel shall notify the Health Services Coordinator Rikel Lightner to give the plaintiff access to the requested manual by June 13, 2017.

2. Production Request 2 is denied in light of the defendant's response that no responsive documents exist.

3. The plaintiff revised Production Requests 3 and 4 during oral argument to request the name of the vendor UCHC used before it switched distributors in November 2011. The defendant agreed to

¹U.S. District Judge Robert N. Chatigny referred the motion to undersigned. (Doc. #37.)

provide this information. Production Requests 3 and 4, as revised, are granted absent objection.

4. Production Requests 7, 8 and 9 are granted as follows. The defendant shall (1) make a good faith effort to produce responsive documents from the specific resources identified by the plaintiff in his motion and (2) provide an updated response by June 13, 2017.

B. Requests for Admission

5. The plaintiff's motion to determine the sufficiency of the defendant's answer to Request for Admission 4 is denied.²

6. The motion to determine the sufficiency of the defendant's answer to Request for Admission 14 is granted. The defendant will provide an amended answer in which he explains his response in greater detail and with more clarity.

C. Interrogatories

7. Interrogatory 2 is denied without prejudice. The plaintiff shall (1) reword the interrogatory to be more clear and attach the relevant document and (2) serve the request on defense counsel by June 13, 2017. The defendant's response is due by June 20, 2017. If necessary, the plaintiff may file a motion to compel as to the interrogatory by June 27, 2017.

8. As to Interrogatories 7 and 8 and Second Request for

²Pursuant to Production Request 3 and 4, the defendant shall provide the plaintiff with the name of the vendor.

Production 2, defense counsel stated during oral argument that the defendant did not have access to the plaintiff's medical records. The plaintiff indicated that he would authorize the defendant to have access to his health information so that the defendant could respond more fully to the requests. By June 9, 2017, defense counsel shall send the plaintiff an authorization form so that he may authorize the release of his medical information to the defendant. Upon review of the plaintiff's medical records, the defendant shall serve an amended answer to these requests by June 20, 2017.

9. Interrogatories 9 and 10 are denied.

10. Interrogatory 16 is granted. The defendant shall serve an amended answer that clearly responds to the query.

SO ORDERED at Hartford, Connecticut this 6th day of June, 2017.

_____/s/_____
Donna F. Martinez
United States Magistrate Judge