

The Court finds that plaintiff's discovery requests are premature. See, e.g., Bacon v. Maricopa County Sheriff's Office, No. Civ. A. 08-1673, 2008 WL 4629506, at *4 (D. Ariz. Oct. 17, 2008) (in denying plaintiff's motion to compel discovery, court noted that "Plaintiff's request for discovery is premature. Defendants have not been served or filed an answer"); Famous v. Pollard, No. 07-C-847, 2008 WL 444652, at *1 (E.D. Wis. Feb. 15, 2008) ("[T]his case has not entered the discovery phase thereby making the plaintiff's motion [to compel discovery] premature. Once the defendants have filed an answer, the court will enter a scheduling order setting deadlines for the completion of discovery as well as the filing of dispositive motions"); Conley v. Dormire, No. 07-4179, 2008 WL 141682, at *3 (W.D. Mo. Jan. 11, 2008) ("Plaintiff's discovery requests . . . are also premature and are improperly filed with this court. Discovery is properly conducted after an answer has been filed[.] . . .").

Accordingly, for all the foregoing reasons,

IT IS hereby ORDERED this 23rd day of March 2010 that "Plaintiff Request for Production of Documents" is DENIED without prejudice.

/s/ Joel Schneider
JOEL SCHNEIDER
United States Magistrate Judge