

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Walter Glass, |) | C/A No.: 1:20-1972-SAL-SVH |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | |
| |) | ORDER |
| Jasmine Hill; Cunningham; Tyatta |) | |
| Davis; and Wali Khan, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |
| |) | |


Walter Glass (“Plaintiff”), proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed a complaint alleging defendants violated his constitutional rights. [ECF No. 1]. This matter comes before the court on the motion of Plaintiff to compel Defendants to respond to discovery. [ECF No. 60]. On February 1, 2021, the court ordered Defendants to produce documents requested by Plaintiff, which request was construed as Plaintiff’s First Request for Production of Documents. [ECF No. 54 at 2]. The order directed Defendants to respond to the discovery requests no later than March 2, 2021. *Id.* On April 8, 2021, Plaintiff filed the instant motion alleging Defendants had failed to respond.¹ [ECF No. 60]. Defendants failed to file a response to Plaintiff’s motion to compel.

¹ In his motion to compel, Plaintiff seeks his medical records, which were not included in the court’s February 1, 2021 order. The court finds that Defendants will not be prejudiced by also producing to Plaintiff his own medical records.

In light of the foregoing, the court grants Plaintiff's motion to compel. Defendants are directed to provide responses to the discovery requests by May 7, 2021. Because Defendants failed to timely respond to the discovery, any and all objections are deemed waived under Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(b)(4). Defendants are advised that failure to comply with the court's order may result in sanctions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

April 23, 2021
Columbia, South Carolina



Shiva V. Hodges
United States Magistrate Judge