

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

TRAVIS L. ADAMS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CASE NO. 4:05CV450-MP/AK

MAXIMO VELASCO, et al,

Defendants.

_____ /

ORDER

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's Third Motion to Compel. (Doc. 158). At issue in the motion were all the discovery requests previously ordered to be produced by the Court, which are Request Nos. 1 through 9 in Plaintiff's Motion for Discovery (doc. 124). (Doc. 152). Defendants have responded that all documents "(which had not been objected to)" were produced, (with one exception, which was sent on the day the response was filed), but Plaintiff had transferred to another institution and so they were re-mailed to him. (Doc. 161).

In his reply to Defendants' response, Plaintiff contends that none of the documents produced were fully responsive to his requests and the Court's order, and he is reasserting his motion (doc. 158) in full. (Doc. 164).

Plaintiff is correct. Discovery in this case has consumed far more time than necessary. This is not a products liability case. There are nine document requests at issue which were deemed served on July 1, 2008. If Defendants responded to these requests and asserted objections, the Court needs to see them. If documents were produced that are responsive to the requests, apparently the Court is going to have to review them as well. If either party has failed to represent the status of these requests and responses truthfully or accurately, then one or the other is going to pay for the costs of their error.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED:

Defendants shall on or before **May 20, 2009**, file a Supplement to their Memorandum in Opposition (doc. 161) which includes the objections referred to in that memorandum and copies of the documents produced as represented in the Notice of Compliance dated March 19, 2009, including the document referred to in their Memorandum, which was inadvertently omitted from the earlier production. The documents produced shall be grouped and identified by the document request number they are purportedly responsive to.

DONE AND ORDERED this 6th day of May, 2009.

s/ A. KORNBLUM

ALLAN KORNBLUM
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE