UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

RALPH DAVID HATHAWAY,)
Plaintiff,)
VS.)
LINCOLN CO. POLICE, et al.,)
Defendants.))
	,

Case No. 4:16cv1761 SNLJ

MEMORANDUM and ORDER

Plaintiff, acting pro se, claims his constitutional rights were violated by defendant police officers. This Court dismissed plaintiff's complaint on August 29, 2017 because plaintiff had not updated his address with the Court as required. Plaintiff moved to reopen the case on the basis that he attempted to notify the Court of his changed address. The Court granted the motion and reopened plaintiff's case, ordered the defendants to resend their discovery requests to plaintiff at his new prison, and ordered plaintiff to respond to the discovery requests by July 1, 2018. (#31). Defendants moved for sanctions against plaintiff for failing to respond to discovery requests. (#34.)

In response to that motion, this Court wrote:

The Court is inclined to grant defendants' motion. However, because it appears plaintiff filed his motion seeking a stay of discovery and requesting a copy of his complaint and the docket sheet before the July 1 due date, the Court will afford plaintiff one more chance to prosecute his case. Although plaintiff states that he is unskilled and untrained in law, he appears able to adequately represent himself in this straightforward case. His request for counsel will be denied for the same reasons it was denied previously. (#22.)

Plaintiff must respond substantively to defendants' discovery requests no later than December 14, 2018. ... Should plaintiff fail to comply with this order, the Court will dismiss plaintiff's case.

(#39 at 2.)

Defendants have again moved for sanctions against plaintiff because plaintiff has again failed to respond timely to discovery requests. (#42.) Plaintiff responded to the motion and states he is not willfully disregarding court orders. Plaintiff states he has not received any requests. He states that on or around November 28, 2018, he sent a letter to defense counsel, which he copied to the Court, asking for them to resend their discovery requests. Plaintiff says he did not hear back from defendants.

Defendants reply that because plaintiff admits he has not responded to discovery requests that their motion should be granted. They argue that because plaintiff knew defendants had been ordered to resend their written discovery requests by June 1, 2018, and because plaintiff delayed for six months before alleging he never received the discovery requests, that plaintiff's delay is unreasonable and thus sanctionable.

The Court agrees. The Court was explicit in its November 9, 2018 order that, "<u>Should plaintiff fail to comply with this order, the Court will dismiss plaintiff's</u> <u>case</u>." The Court has provided plaintiff with numerous second chances, including reopening plaintiff's case and extending deadlines. Plaintiff failed to comply with the November 9 order, and his lawsuit will be dismissed.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendant's motion for sanctions (#42) is GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendant's motion for extension of time (#46) is DENIED AS MOOT.

Dated this <u>13th</u> day of February, 2019.

Timbach !!

STEPHEN N. LIMBAUGH, JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE