

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY  
BOWLING GREEN DIVISION  
CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:15-CV-00096-GNS**

**ERIC TODD LYVERS**

**PLAINTIFF**

**VS.**

**JAMES NEWKIRK, *ET AL***

**DEFENDANTS**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION  
AND ORDER**

Before the Court are the motions of Plaintiff Eric Todd Lyvers to compel discovery responses from Defendant James Newkirk, DN 68, and from Defendant Jordan Jones, DN 69. The Defendants have filed responses at DN 74 and 73. There has been no reply.

Mr. Lyvers states in his motion that he submitted requests for admission, interrogatories, and requests for production of documents to the Defendants and that, in response, the Defendants only provided “‘Smoke Screen’ answers and Excuses for Answers” (DN 68, p. 1; DN 69, p. 1). His motions reproduce several of his discovery requests, but he does not discuss the Defendants’ responses or the basis for his belief that the responses are insufficient under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Where a Plaintiff fails to explain how a discovery response is inadequate, a motion to compel will be denied. Hibbs v. Marcum, No. 3:16-CV-146-TBR-LLK, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26725, \*15 (W.D. Ky. Feb. 20, 2018).

**ORDER**

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motions to compel, DN 68 and 69, are DENIED.

Copies: Eric Todd Lyvers, *pro se*  
Counsel