

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

-----x
:
CHARLES C. WILLIAMS : Civil No. 3:15CV00933 (AWT)
:
v. :
:
HARTFORD POLICE DEPT., : October 7, 2015
et al. :
:
-----x

RULING ON PENDING MOTIONS [Doc. ##46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52]

The plaintiff has filed two motions seeking discovery and a motion to correct the page numbers in his amended complaint. The defendants have filed two motions for extensions of time and a motion for entry of a scheduling order.

Defendants' Motions [Doc. ##46, 52]

The defendants seek an extension of time until December 1, 2015, to respond to the plaintiff's September 2, 2015, discovery requests. [Doc. #46]. The defendants further seek an extension of time until November 11, 2015, to respond to the plaintiff's September 11, 2015, discovery requests [Doc. #52]. The plaintiff objects to the requested extensions of time. These motions are granted, over objection, as the extensions requested are reasonable and the defendants have shown good cause. The defendants shall respond to the requests by the dates specified in the motions.

Plaintiff's Motions [Doc. ##47, 48, 49]

The plaintiff has filed a discovery request with the court. As the court previously instructed the plaintiff, discovery requests are not to be filed with the court. See Doc. #45. The plaintiff's discovery request [Doc. #48] is denied as moot.

The plaintiff also has filed a motion seeking to compel responses to discovery requests. As the court has granted the defendants an extension of time to respond, this motion [Doc. #47] is denied as moot. The plaintiff is cautioned that if he refiles this motion, or files any similar motion in the future, he must comply with the requirements of Rule 37 of the Local Rules of Civil Procedure.

The plaintiff has filed a motion seeking to renumber the pages of his amended complaint. The court cannot alter any document filed with the court. Thus, the plaintiff's motion [Doc. #49] is denied. The court does note, however, that the information on page 33 of the amended complaint is properly included in paragraph 75, which begins on page 42.

Motion for Amendment of Scheduling Order [Doc. #51]

Finally, the defendants have submitted a proposed scheduling order which would extend all of the pre-trial deadlines in this case and delay the filing of dispositive

motions until March 2017. In its Initial Review Order, the Court ordered that all discovery in this case was to be completed on or before January 31, 2016, and any dispositive motions should be filed on or before March 1, 2016. The defendants have provided no reason why they cannot comply with the current scheduling order. Thus, the defendants' motion [Doc. #51] is denied.

An in-person conference shall be held on **Monday, November 2, 2015, at 10:00 a.m.** in Courtroom 5 of the United States Courthouse at 141 Church Street, New Haven, Connecticut. Should any party wish to propose an amended scheduling order, the party must file an appropriate motion **on or before October 26, 2015,** showing good cause for the requests made. The parties should be prepared to discuss the schedule for moving forward with this case and to address all motions pending at the time of the conference. The parties should also be prepared to discuss whether a referral for settlement conference would be productive in this case and, if so, when.

In summary, the defendants' motions for extension of time [Docs. ##46, 52] are **GRANTED**. The plaintiff's request for production of documents [Doc. #48] and the plaintiff's motion to compel [Doc. #47] are **DENIED** as moot. The plaintiff's request to

correct page numbering [Doc. #49] is DENIED. The defendants' proposed scheduling order [Doc. #51] is DENIED. The parties shall comply with the current scheduling order until further order of the Court.

It is so ordered.

Signed this 7th day of October, 2015 at New Haven,
Connecticut.

_____/s/_____
Sarah A. L. Merriam
United States Magistrate Judge