

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
 EVANSVILLE DIVISION

MARSHALL JACKSON,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	3:07-cv-2-RLY-WGH
	)	
DR. ALEX PLATZ,	)	
RITA ETIENNE, R.N.,	)	
SUPERINTENDENT GILBERT PETERS,	)	
SUPERINTENDENT DONALD STIEN,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR  
 ORDER COMPELLING DISCOVERY**

This matter is before the Honorable William G. Hussmann, Jr., United States Magistrate Judge, on Plaintiff’s Objections and Motion for Order Compelling Discovery as to defendant Gilbert Peters filed May 24, 2010. (Docket No. 149). A Response in Opposition to Motion to Compel was filed by defendant Gilbert Peters on June 11, 2010. (Docket No. 155). No reply brief has been filed.

The Magistrate Judge, being duly advised, now **GRANTS, in part,** and **DENIES, in part,** the motion to compel as follows:

1. To the extent that plaintiff argues that defendant Gilbert Peters has waived any objections by failing to timely respond to these interrogatories and requests for production, the Magistrate Judge concludes that there has been an insufficient showing of prejudice in this instance to warrant waiver of all objections. The court will, therefore, consider the objections and privileges raised.


2. With respect to Gilbert Peters' response to plaintiff's first request for production of documents, the following orders apply:

- (a) Request for Production 1: Defendants are to provide from the personnel file of defendant Peters any complaints or grievances that relate to a claim that he has improperly denied visitation privileges to any inmate. No other portions of the personnel file need be produced.
- (b) Requests for Production 2-9, 11-12 and 14-16: The objections are overruled, and the motion to compel as to these requests is **DENIED**.
- (c) Request for Production 10: If defendant Peters maintains work lists or records of offenders who worked on the BCF road crews during the time between June 1, 2006, and up to and including August 30, 2006, those documents must be produced. However, defendant Peters need not create a list or search other records to produce the names of the offenders if assignment records or logs are not maintained.
- (d) Request for Production 13: Defendants are ordered to produce redacted copies of any and all incidents under the Adult Disciplinary Procedures, Class A Violation Nos. 111 and 113, for the time period January 1, 2006, up to and including December 31, 2006. Any records maintained by the Adult Disciplinary Board for those violations during that time period should be produced, redacting the name and identifying information of the offender, except that the last three digits of the offender number and race shall be visible.
- (c) Requests for Admissions 10 and 17: The motion to compel is **DENIED**.

To the extent the plaintiff seeks to compel additional information, that motion to compel is **DENIED**, as the plaintiff's brief does not state with specificity what other relief he is requesting with respect to any other items.

**SO ORDERED.**

**Dated:** July 12, 2010

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William G. Hussmann, Jr.  
United States Magistrate Judge  
Southern District of Indiana

**Copies to:**

MARSHALL JACKSON  
11048  
Indianapolis Re-Entry Educational Facility  
401 N. Randolph Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46201

Neal F. Bailen  
STITES & HARBISON, LLP  
nbailen@stites.com

Lynne Denise Hammer  
OFFICE OF THE INDIANA ATTORNEY GENERAL  
Lynne.Hammer@atg.in.gov

Jeremy Michael Padgett  
TYRA LAW FIRM P.C.  
jerry.padgett@tyralaw.net

Bruce Benjamin Paul  
STITES & HARBISON, LLP  
bpaul@stites.com

Kevin C. Tyra  
THE TYRA LAW FIRM, P.C.  
kevin.tyra@tyralaw.net

Cory Christian Voight  
INDIANA OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
cory.voight@atg.in.gov