

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
GAINESVILLE DIVISION**

DUKE F. CRANFORD,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CASE NO. 1:09CV70-MP/AK

A. D. HAMMACK, et al,

Defendants.

_____ /

ORDER

The Court has read the Defendants' response and finds it to be well taken. (Doc. 57). The Court granted Plaintiff's motion to compel in an Order dated December 28, 2009, (doc. 56), based on his representation that there had been no response to his discovery requests. As Defendants have shown by their attached exhibits, a response was made, including objections to three requests, which the Court also finds are well taken. Consequently, the Order dated December 28, 2009, is hereby **VACATED IN PART**, insofar as the motion to compel was granted. The motion, (doc. 54), upon reconsideration, is **DENIED**.

Plaintiff has already responded to the pending motion for summary judgment, (doc. 51), and discovery has now expired. Although Plaintiff was offered the opportunity to make a specific request of items from his institutional file on November 23, 2009, he has not done so, and the Court considers the matter closed. No further

motions should be filed by Plaintiff and the Court will rule upon the pending motion for summary judgment in due course.

DONE AND ORDERED this 4th day of January, 2010.

s/ A. KORNBLUM _____
ALLAN KORNBLUM
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE