

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
DUBLIN DIVISION

CURTIS HUNTER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CV 314-035
)	
CORRECTIONS CORPORATION OF)	
AMERICA, et al.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	


ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion for partial reconsideration as to the Court’s Order on Plaintiff’s motion to compel. (Doc. no. 64.) Plaintiff wishes to litigate the timeliness of Defendants’ responses to his requests for production, despite those responses containing certificates of service showing that the responses were sent within the requisite thirty days. (Doc. no. 44, pp. 1, 6-34.) There is no basis for calling into question the veracity of defense counsel's certification that he mailed the discovery responses to Plaintiff on April 23, 2015. Why Plaintiff allegedly did not receive them is a question left unanswered and subject only to speculation, at best. Just as importantly, the objections raised in Defendants' discovery responses had merit, and consideration of them allowed the Court to fashion a reasonable and

fair scope of discovery. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration.

(Doc. no. 64.)

SO ORDERED this 9th day of October, 2015, at Augusta, Georgia.



BRIAN K. EPPS
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA