

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES EQUAL EMPLOYMENT)	
OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Civil No. 05 cv 0208
)	
v.)	Judge Zagel
)	Magistrate Ashman
SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

**PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO DETERMINE
THE SUFFICIENCY OF RESPONSES TO REQUESTS TO ADMIT FACTS**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 36(a), Plaintiff Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”) hereby moves to determine the sufficiency of Defendant Sidley Austin Brown & Wood’s (“Sidley”) Amended and Supplemental Responses to EEOC’s October 3, 2005 Requests to Admit Facts, stating as follows:

1. On October 3, 2005, EEOC served on Sidley EEOC’s First Request for Admissions.
2. Sidley responded on November 16, 2005 to EEOC’s First Request for Admissions.
3. On March 22, 2006, Sidley served EEOC with Amended and Supplemental Responses to EEOC’s First Request for Admissions.
4. Response nos. 3, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, and 23 of Sidley’s Amended and Supplemental Responses do not comply with the requirements of Rule 36 in that they contain extraneous material that does not fairly meet the substance of the requests.

5. EEOC incorporates as though fully set forth herein its memorandum in support of this Motion styled “Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion to Determine the Sufficiency of Responses to Requests to Admit Facts.”

6. For the reasons stated herein and in the supporting memorandum, Sidley should be deemed to have admitted the matters to which it has not provided responses that comply with Rule 36.

WHEREFORE, EEOC respectfully requests entry of an order deeming admitted without qualification request nos. 3, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 21, and 23 of its First Request for Admissions.

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Justin Mulaire
Laurie S. Elkin
Justin Mulaire
Trial Attorney
Equal Employment Opportunity
Commission
500 W. Madison Street
Suite 2800
Chicago, Illinois 60661
(312) 353-7726