

discrimination in the district court.” Laber v. Harvey, 438 F.3d 404, 420 (4th Cir. 2006) (emphasis added) (citing McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green, 411 U.S. 792, 93 S. Ct. 1817 (1973); Chandler v. Roudebush, 425 U.S. 840, 844-45, 96 S. Ct. 1949 (1976)). Accordingly, for this and the other reasons stated in Defendants’ brief, Plaintiff’s “Motion to Deem Admitted” (document #59) is denied.


NOW THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED:

1. Plaintiff’s “Motion to Compel Discovery” (document #58) and “Motion to Deem Admitted” (document #59) are **DENIED**.

2. The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to the pro se Plaintiff; to defense counsel; and to the Honorable Max O. Cogburn, Jr.

SO ORDERED.

Signed: July 11, 2011



David S. Cayer
United States Magistrate Judge

