

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

JEFFREY BAKER,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBERT HERTZ, et al.,

Defendants.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Case No. 3:15-cv-600-JPG-DGW

ORDER

WILKERSON, Magistrate Judge:

Now pending before the Court are various Motions:

1. Motion to Compel filed by Plaintiff on October 7, 2015 (Doc. 58). This Motion is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. Plaintiff served two requests to produce on August 2, 2015 and September 13, 2015. These requests were served prior to the date when a responsive pleading was due, September 22, 2015. These requests also were made prior to entry of this Court's Scheduling Order, entered on October 20, 2015, which set forth various procedures and deadlines for discovery. To the extent that Plaintiff has not received documents that he has requested and that Defendants have not produced through initial disclosures or otherwise, Plaintiff may refile this motion indicating which specific documents (and corresponding requests) he is lacking.
2. Motion for Recruitment of Counsel filed by Plaintiff on October 19, 2015 (Doc. 59). The Motion is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**. On July 13, 2015, this Court denied, without prejudice, Plaintiff's previous motion for recruitment of counsel noting that Plaintiff was educated and appeared competent to litigate this matter without counsel. Plaintiff now indicates that he is unsure what to do, that he has limited access to resources, and that he would be greatly benefitted

by counsel. From Plaintiff's filings, however, he appears wholly competent to request relief from this Court, his pleadings are clear and concise, and, as indicated in this Court's previous Order, his claims are not complex. Accordingly, counsel will not be recruited at this time.

3. Motion to Compel filed by Plaintiff on February 29, 2016 (Doc. 73). The Motion is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff states that he served discovery requests on October 28, 2015. Defendants failed to respond, Defendants failed to seek additional time to respond, and, when Plaintiff inquired about responses on February 9, 2016, no responses were forthcoming. Defendants also have failed to respond to the Motion, thereby admitting the merits pursuant to Local Rule 7.1. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(b)(4), 34(b)(2), and 37, Defendants **SHALL** respond to the discovery requests, without objection, within 2 weeks of the date of this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 19, 2016



DONALD G. WILKERSON
United States Magistrate Judge