Knox v. Furlong et al Doc. 68

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

TED KNOX,)
Plaintiff,)
v.) Case No. 3:10-cv-1001-GPM-DGW
DR. FURLONG, et al.,)
Defendants.)
)

ORDER

WILKERSON, Magistrate Judge:

Now pending before the Court is Plaintiff Ted Knox's Motion to Compel Disclosure and for Extension of Time filed August 14, 2012 (Doc. 64). Plaintiff asks the Court to compel Defendants to answer his second set of interrogatories submitted on May 23, 2012. Because he believes these responses to be vital, he asks the Court to grant him an extension of time to respond to the Defendant's pending motions for summary judgment.

In response, Defendants inform the Court that Defendants Furlong, Melton, Qualls, and Miller have produced responses to Plaintiff's second set of interrogatories, but that the affidavits of Defendants George and Butler are still in process through their union representative (Doc. 65). Defendants ask the Court to allow them fourteen additional days to produce those affidavits.

Plaintiff's request that the Court compel Defendants to respond to his discovery requests is **GRANTED**. Defendants' request for fourteen additional days to produce affidavits is also **GRANTED**. Defendants George and Butler shall produce affidavits and discovery responses by **September 18, 2012.**

Plaintiff indicated that he required receipt of discovery requests and affidavits before he could respond to the pending motions for summary judgment (Docs. 60 and 63). The Court notes, however, that Plaintiff filed responses to those motions on August 31, 2012. Accordingly, Plaintiff's request for additional time to respond to the pending motions is **MOOT**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: September 4, 2012

DONALD G. WILKERSON United States Magistrate Judge

Wonald Filkerson