Durham v. Niffenegger et al Doc. 82

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

DAVID DURHAM,
Plaintiff,

vs.

DETECTIVE JERRY NIFFENEGGER, et. al.
Defendants.

Case No. 1:18-cv-91
McFarland, J.
Litkovitz, M.J.

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff David Durham's motion to compel (Doc. 80). The Court's Standing Order, at §§ I.D.2-3, sets forth its procedures regarding motions relating to discovery. The Court does not entertain discovery motions until the parties have satisfied those procedures. First, the parties must attempt to resolve the dispute by extrajudicial means, which the Court defines to include both in-writing and telephonic efforts. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1); S.D. Ohio Civ. R. 37.1. If unsuccessful, the parties are to contact the Court's Courtroom Deputy to schedule an informal discovery conference.

Plaintiff's motion (Doc. 80) is therefore **STRICKEN**. Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to comply with the Court's Standing Order as referenced herein.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 4/28/2021

Karen L. Litkovitz
United States Magistrate Judge

Dockets.Justia.com