

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION

ALAN McQUEEN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	Case No. 1:17CV155 ACL
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Presently pending before the Court is Defendant’s Motion to Compel Plaintiff’s Answers to Defendant’s Interrogatories and Requests to Produce pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a)(3)(B). (Doc. 17.)

In its Motion, Defendant states that the Government served its Interrogatories and Requests to Produce on Plaintiff on February 1, 2018, and Plaintiff’s responses to this discovery were due on March 6, 2018. (Doc. 17.) Defendant indicates that, despite Defendant’s multiple attempts to obtain the discovery without the Court’s invention, Plaintiff has failed to answer the Interrogatories or produce the responsive documents.

A hearing was held on Defendant’s Motion on this date, at which both parties appeared in person. Plaintiff, who is proceeding *pro se*, represented that he provided the requested documents to Defendant’s attorney immediately prior to the hearing. Defendant’s attorney confirmed that Plaintiff had provided him a file folder containing documents. Plaintiff testified that he had not yet answered Defendant’s Interrogatories, and requested additional time in which to do so. The Court granted Plaintiff’s oral request for an extension, and gave Plaintiff until April 20, 2018, to answer Defendant’s Interrogatories.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37, “[a] party seeking discovery may move for an order compelling an answer, designation, production, or inspection.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(3)(B).

Although Plaintiff is acting *pro se*, and his pleadings are held to a less stringent standard, he must still comply with the Rules of Civil Procedure, including local rules. *See American Inmate Paralegal Assoc. v. Cline*, 859 F.2d 59, 61 (8th Cir. 1988).

The Court will deny Defendant’s Motion to Compel without prejudice, meaning that it may be brought again at a later time if Plaintiff fails to timely provide the requested discovery.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff is granted an extension of time, until **April 20, 2018**, to answer Defendant’s Interrogatories.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant’s Motion to Compel (Doc. 17) is **denied without prejudice**. Defendant may renew its Motion to Compel if Plaintiff does not fully comply with Defendant’s discovery requests by April 20, 2018.



ABBIE CRITES-LEONI
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated this 12th day of April, 2018.