

responses are inadequate or what additional documents or information he seeks. The absence of such specificity alone warrants denial of the motion. *Forest v. Barnes Jewish Hosp.*, No. 4:07CV258-DJS, 2008 WL 957681, *2, (E. D. Mo. Apr. 7, 2008) (holding that “[a] plaintiff’s motion to compel a discovery request must be particularly stated so that the defendant can make a meaningful response to that request, and so that the Court’s time is not unnecessarily consumed”).

In light of Plaintiff’s failure to comply with Local Rule 37-3.04, and to describe with particularity why Defendant’s responses to his discovery requests are lacking, the Court will deny Plaintiff’s motion without prejudice to refiling and require the parties to confer in accordance with Local Rule 37-3.04. Further, such conference must be held either in person or by telephone; an exchange of correspondence or e-mails will not suffice.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motion to compel (Doc. No. 37) is **DENIED without prejudice** to refiling in the event that the parties are unable to resolve this dispute.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that not later than **January 24, 2013**, the parties shall confer in good faith, in person or by telephone, to resolve their dispute regarding Defendant’s responses to Plaintiff’s First Request to Produce and First Set of Interrogatories.



AUDREY G. FLEISSIG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 14th day of January 14, 2014.