UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

	•	
JEFFREY DeANGELIS,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	CASE NO. 3:16-cv-307 (MPS)
	:	
V.	:	
	:	
MONICA FARINELLA, et al., Defendants.	:	
	:	MARCH 10, 2017

RULING ON MOTIONS TO COMPEL [ECF Nos. 34, 35]

The plaintiff has filed two motions seeking to compel discovery responses in this case. In the first motion, Plaintiff states that some of the responses refer him to medical records written by Dr. Figura but her handwriting is difficult to read. In addition, he disputes the accuracy of some of defendant Figura's responses. Plaintiff asks the Court to order defendant Figura to reanswer the interrogatories. In the second motion, Plaintiff seeks responses to his June 20, 2016 discovery requests.

Motions to compel are governed by Rule 37 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and District of Connecticut Local Rule 37. Both the federal and local rules require 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 Doe v. Mastoloni*, 307 F.R.D. 305, 313 (D. Conn. 2015). If discussions are not successful, the local rule requires the party moving to compel to submit an affidavit certifying the attempted resolution and specifying which issues were resolved and which remain. D. Conn. L. Civ. R. 37(a). Local Rule 37(b)1 requires the moving party to file a memorandum containing a concise statement of the nature of the case, a specific verbatim listing of each item of discovery sought and, immediately following each listing, setting forth the reasons why the item should be allowed. In addition, copies of the discovery requests must be included as exhibits.

The plaintiff does not indicate that he has made any attempt to resolve this dispute with defendants' counsel and has not submitted the required affidavit. Nor has he specified why each particular item should be allowed. Thus, the plaintiff has not complied with the requirements of Local Rule 37.

The plaintiff's motions to compel [**ECF Nos. 34, 35**] are **DENIED** without prejudice. **SO ORDERED** this 10th day of March 2017 at Hartford, Connecticut.

/s/

Michael P. Shea United States District Judge