

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION**

<p><b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>Plaintiff,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>v.</b></p> <p><b>\$20,000.00 in UNITED STATES FUNDS</b> <b>First-Named Defendant Property,</b></p> <p><b>CARLOS CARDOSA,</b> <b>Claimant.</b></p> <hr style="width: 40%; margin-left: 0;"/>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p><b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:14-CV-126 (MTT)</b></p>
--	---	--

**ORDER**

Before the Court is the Plaintiff’s motion to compel Claimant Carlos Cardosa to respond to discovery requests. (Doc. 20).

Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1) requires that a party moving to compel discovery “include certification that the movant has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the person or party failing to make disclosure or discovery in an effort to obtain it without court action.” Further, “a district court is allowed a range of choice’ in deciding whether to grant or deny a motion to compel discovery responses, and that decision will be reversed only for an abuse of discretion.” *Chatham v. Adcock*, 2007 WL 2904117, at \*5 (N.D. Ga.) (quoting *Holloman v. Mail-Well Corp.*, 443 F.3d 832, 837 (11th Cir. 2006)). The Court finds that Plaintiff has met this burden and has shown a good faith effort to resolve the instant discovery dispute without judicial intervention.

Claimant has failed to respond to the Plaintiff’s First Set of Interrogatories and

Request for Production of documents dated November 3, 2014. (Doc. 20-2). Neither has the Claimant provided any explanation for the delay or requested additional time to submit his response. Also, the Claimant has failed to cooperate with Plaintiff's attempts to confer regarding the status of the outstanding discovery and the Claimant's failure to comply with the Plaintiff's discovery requests.

Accordingly, based on the representations made to the Court pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 37, the Plaintiff's motion to compel is **GRANTED**. (Doc. 20). The Claimant is **ORDERED** to fully and completely respond to the Plaintiff's First Set of Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents by July 14, 2015. Failure to comply with this order may result in further sanctions against the Claimant.

**SO ORDERED**, this 30th day of June, 2015.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell  
MARC T. TREADWELL  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT