Brown v. Lucas et al Doc. 23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CIVIL ACTION NO. 16-10977-GAO

ANTHONY BROWN, Plaintiff.

v.

OFFICER LUCAS, RANDOLPH POLICE DEPARTMENT and OFFICER STAFFIER, RANDOLPH POLICE DEPARTMENT Defendants.

ORDER October 16, 2017

O'TOOLE, D.J.

The defendants have filed a Motion to Compel asking the Court to order the plaintiff to respond to their interrogatories and requests for production of documents. The plaintiff opposes this motion for a number of reasons. None of them are sufficient to justify denying the defendants' motion. The plaintiff also asks for additional time to respond to the discovery requests so that he may retain counsel. While the Court encourages the plaintiff to seek representation, he filed this case originally in state court in March 2016, and has had ample time to seek counsel.

Therefore, the Motion to Compel (dkt. no. 20) is GRANTED. The plaintiff shall respond to the defendants' discovery requests within thirty-five (35) days of the entry of this Order. To the extent that the plaintiff has genuine, good faith objections to the defendants' discovery requests, he should state them succinctly, citing applicable Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as appropriate.

Additionally, the plaintiff's Motion for Relief (dkt. no. 17) and Motion for Evidentiary Hearing (dkt. no. 21) are both DENIED. By those motions, the plaintiff purportedly seeks relief

from the Court's prior Order on the defendants' motion to dismiss, even though the Court ruled in his favor by denying that motion. It is unclear what relief the plaintiff is seeking.

It is SO ORDERED.

/s/ George A. O'Toole, Jr. United States District Judge