Cox v. Davis et al Doc. 66

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA FLORENCE DIVISION

CHAVIS LARANZO COX, #327335,	) C/A NO.: 4:13-cv-00125-MGL-TER
PLAINTIFF,	)
VS.	) ORDER
ANTHONY DAVIS; BRUCE OBERMAN; ANTHONY J. PADULA,	) )
DEFENDANTS.	) ) )

This matter came before the Court upon a Motion to Compel Discovery filed by Plaintiff on October 29, 2013. (Doc. # 47). Defendant responded to the motion to compel stating that he is unable to determine which discovery the Plaintiff has served on the Defendant that he seeks to compel further response and/or deems incomplete, but has updated his responses to Plaintiff's discovery in his possession and forwarded to Plaintiff on February 26, 2014, out of an abundance of caution. Therefore, this motion is deemed moot.<sup>1</sup>

IT IS SO ORDERED.

February <u>28</u>, 2014 Florence, South Carolina s/Thomas E. Rogers, III
Thomas E. Rogers, III
United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Alternatively, Plaintiff's motion does not comply with Local Rule 37.01 (A) and (B) due to Plaintiff's failure to submit the required documents to allow proper review by the court and/or the motion is not timely. Thus, the motion is denied.