| UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT<br>SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YOR | DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOC #: |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
|                                                              | XDATE FILED: 11/22/2021 .            |
| JOSEPH PUDDU, et al.,                                        |                                      |
| Plain                                                        | tiffs, 15-CV-08061 (AJN)(SN)         |
| -against-                                                    | <u>ORDER</u>                         |
| 6D GLOBAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,                                | et al.,                              |
| Defer                                                        | ndants.                              |
|                                                              | V                                    |

## SARAH NETBURN, United States Magistrate Judge:

Defendant seeks reconsideration of the Court's Order imposing attorney's fees on the grounds that he has now produced responsive documents and because his failure to comply previously with Court orders was unintentional. The motion is DENIED. On September 22, 2021, Defendant was ordered to produce amended responses to Plaintiff's discovery demands by October 6, 2021. Defendant failed to comply, and Plaintiffs filed a letter motion on October 15, 2021. The Court again ordered Defendant to comply, now by October 22, 2021. Defendant failed to comply, and Plaintiffs filed a letter motion on October 25, 2021. After more than a week had passed and Defendant had not responded, the Court ordered Defendant to serve amended responses by November 8, 2021 (now, the third deadline), and ordered Defendant to pay the legal fees incurred by his repeated failure to comply.

Court orders are not advisory, to which a party may choose to follow or not. Although Defendant contends that he has now complied fully with his discovery obligations – Plaintiffs dispute this; but this question is not yet before the Court – his failure to follow Court orders is undisputed. Defendant claims that he was working to comply with a November 10, 2021

deadline for the "substantial completion of document discovery." But Defendant's failures are

with respect to interim deadlines, deadlines that he permitted to come and go without action.

Defendant also pleads that these deadlines were too onerous because of the sprawling nature of

discovery. But self-help is not the solution. Finally, Defendant claims that his failure to respond

to Plaintiff's motion was justified because he had 14 days to respond under the Federal Rules. To

avoid this problem in the future, the parties shall respond to discovery disputes within three

business days pursuant to this Court's Individual Rules of Practice.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully requested to terminate the motions at ECF Nos. 307 &

308.

SO ORDERED.

SARAH NETBURN

United States Magistrate Judge

DATED: N

New York, New York November 22, 2021

2