

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

JOSEPH CRUSSIAH,

Plaintiff,

v.

Inova Health System,

Defendant.

\*

\*

\*

Civil Action No. PX 14-4017

\*

\*

\*\*\*\*\*

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

On July 13, 2016, Plaintiff Joseph Crussiah (“Crussiah”) propounded on Defendant Inova Health System (“Inova”) a “Production of Documents Request and an Interrogatories Request.” The documents request essentially asks Inova to produce all documents in its possession related to its interactions with Crussiah. ECF No. 45-1 at 2–12. The interrogatories request includes not only the standard questions but thirty-three additional “interrogatories.” ECF No. 45-1 at 14–26. Inova agreed to respond to these discovery requests within thirty-three (33) days. ECF No. 42-1 at 1. Crussiah propounded another set of interrogatories on Inova on September 12, 2016, but a response to this second set of interrogatories is not due until October 17th.

On August 22, 2016, Crussiah filed a Motion to Compel, arguing that Inova failed to respond to his discovery requests within the time allowed. ECF No. 42. In a September 15th Order, the Court stated that it was unable to rule on Crussiah’s Motion to Compel without a brief report from Inova regarding the status of discovery. ECF No. 44. Inova promptly responded with a status report on September 21st explaining the progress the parties have made since Crussiah initiated discovery in July 2016. ECF No. 45.

