

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
FORT WAYNE DIVISION**

<p><b>ANTHONY C. MARTIN,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>Plaintiff,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>v.</b></p> <p><b>FORT WAYNE POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al.,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>Defendants.</b></p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p><b>CAUSE NO. 1:11-CV-346</b></p>
--	--	-------------------------------------

**OPINION AND ORDER**

Before the Court in this action advancing various civil rights claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is a motion to compel filed by the *pro se* Plaintiff, claiming that Defendants failed to respond to his First Request for Production of Documents. (Docket # 48.)

Plaintiff’s motion, however, is misplaced, as the record reflects that Defendants did indeed respond to his discovery request, producing some documents and raising some objections. (Docket # 44, 45); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(b) (explaining that a response to a document request includes producing the responsive documents or an objection to the request, including the reasons). Nor does Plaintiff identify with any particularity a specific response that is purportedly inadequate such that the Court could discern whether an order to supplement the response is necessary. *See, e.g., Morris v. Ley*, No. 05 C-0458, 2006 WL 2585029, at \*2 (E.D. Wis. Sep. 7, 2006) (denying *pro se* plaintiff’s motion to compel because it was “nearly impossible to ascertain which documents the plaintiff seeks to have produced”).

Consequently, Plaintiff’s motion to compel (Docket # 48) is DENIED without prejudice, subject to renewal once he compares his discovery requests to the responsive documents and

objections produced by Defendants.

SO ORDERED.

Enter for this 28th day of June, 2012.

/S/ Roger B. Cosby  
Roger B. Cosby,  
United States Magistrate Judge