

1 2011)). Broad assertions of harm are insufficient to meet that burden. *See, e.g., Caesars Entertainment,*
2 237 F.R.D. at 432. Instead, the “objecting party must specifically detail the reasons why each request is
3 irrelevant and may not rely on boilerplate, generalized, conclusory, or speculative arguments.” *AMG Servs.,*
4 291 F.R.D. at 553 (internal quotation and citation omitted).

5 **II. Analysis**

6 Defendant’s motion indicates that, on July 16, 2015, it propounded Interrogatories and Requests
7 for Production of Documents on Plaintiffs. Docket No. 25 at 3. Plaintiffs’ responses were due on August
8 18, 2015; however, Defendant allowed Plaintiffs an extension until September 2, 2015. *Id.* On November
9 12, 2015, Defendant’s counsel spoke with Plaintiffs’ counsel, who advised that the responses would be
10 forthcoming immediately. *Id.* Despite that representation, no responses were provided. *Id.* As of
11 December 8, 2015, when Defendant filed its motion, Plaintiffs had failed to provide any responses to any
12 of the written discovery Defendant had propounded. *Id.* at 2-3.

13 In response, Plaintiffs state that they moved to Arkansas after initiating the instant case, and “have
14 been exceptionally difficult to reach.” Docket No. 32 at 3. Additionally, they submit that they have had
15 unspecified and undocumented health problems, “which impacted their ability to respond to the discovery
16 requests.” *Id.* Plaintiffs concede that their discovery responses were untimely, and submit that they served
17 Defendant with their responses on December 23, 2015. *Id.* Plaintiffs therefore ask the Court to deny
18 Defendant’s motion as moot.¹ *Id.*

19 No reply was filed, and the deadline for filing a reply has now passed. Therefore, the Court does
20 not know whether Defendant agrees with Plaintiffs that their responses are sufficient.

21 Plaintiffs have represented to the Court that they have fully responded, albeit extremely late, to the
22 written discovery that is the subject of Defendant’s motion to compel. *See* Docket No. 32. Defendant has
23 made no representation that Plaintiffs’ responses are insufficient. Accordingly, Defendant’s motion to
24 compel, Docket No. 25, is hereby **DENIED** as moot.

25
26 ¹Plaintiffs also ask the Court not to award Defendant attorneys’ fees for filing its motion to compel,
27 “because the delay in providing discovery responses ... was not the result of any bad faith or improper
28 Defendant has not requested fees in its motion. *See* Docket No. 25. Therefore, the Court will not address
the issue of attorneys’ fees.

1 Additionally, the Court **ADMONISHES** Plaintiffs that they must participate in the case they
2 initiated and abide by all applicable deadlines. Failure to do so in the future may result in sanctions,
3 including dismissal of the instant case.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: January 20, 2016.

6 
7 _____
8 NANCY J. KOPPE
9 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28