

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
OCALA DIVISION**

**GEOFFREY H. ANDERSON,**

**Plaintiff,**

v.

**Case No: 5:15-cv-26-Oc-30PRL**

**JOHN MOORE, CHARLES W.  
RUSSELL, JOHN FLYNN, ANDY  
AULD, SCOTT PENVOSE, GARY S.  
BORDERS, CITY OF GROVELAND  
and LAKE COUNTY FLORIDA**

**Defendants.**

---

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Defendant, the Sheriff of Lake County Gary S. Borders's second motion to compel Plaintiff to comply with Defendant's discovery requests. (Doc. 71). According to Defendant, on December 18, 2015, he requested that Plaintiff answer a set of interrogatories and produce documents, all of which were due thirty days later. Plaintiff failed to timely respond to these requests, which necessitated Defendant's first motion to compel. (Doc. 65).

Although Plaintiff failed to timely respond to Defendant's first motion to compel (as required by Local Rule 3.04(a)), Plaintiff belatedly submitted answers to the interrogatories and responses to the document requests, but the answers to most of the interrogatories were inadequate. Thus, Defendant filed his second motion to compel (Doc. 71) and—given Plaintiff's failure to respond to the first motion to compel—the Court directed Plaintiff to respond to the second motion to compel by March 21, 2016. (Doc. 72). Yet, Plaintiff has again failed to respond to the motion

to compel pending against him. Importantly, under the Case Management and Scheduling Order, discovery closes today, March 22, 2016.

Regarding the merits of Defendant's second motion to compel, the Court agrees that Plaintiff's answers to Interrogatory Questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, and 13 are inadequate. For example, in response to Defendant Sherriff's Interrogatory No. 2, which was a request for very basic information (e.g., Plaintiff's aliases, where he has lived for the past ten years, his Social Security number, date of birth, and marital status), Plaintiff replied "Go to Google." (Doc. 71, Ex. A). Plaintiff's remaining answers are also inadequate and it is noteworthy that Plaintiff has failed to respond to *both* of Defendant's motions to compel.

Accordingly, upon due consideration, Defendant's second motion to compel (Doc. 71) is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff is compelled to provide full and accurate responses to Defendant's Interrogatories, Questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, and 13 on or before **March 29, 2016, failing which sanctions may be imposed, including the dismissal of this action.**

Defendant's request for attorney's fees and costs for bringing its motions to compel is due to be granted pursuant to Rule 37(a)(5)(A) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Within 10 days of the entry date of this Order, **Defendant** is directed to provide an assessment of its reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, necessitated by Plaintiff's inadequate discovery responses. **Plaintiff** shall then have 14 days within which to show cause why costs and fees should not be awarded to Defendant in the amount stated, **failing which the requested costs and fees may be imposed as requested.**

**DONE** and **ORDERED** in Ocala, Florida on March 22, 2016.



---

PHILIP R. LAMMENS  
United States Magistrate Judge

Copies furnished to:

Counsel of Record  
Unrepresented Parties