

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

|                           |   |                           |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| MAURIO RIVERS,            | ) | C/A No. 4:13-1914-RMG-TER |
|                           | ) |                           |
| Plaintiff,                | ) |                           |
|                           | ) |                           |
| vs.                       | ) | ORDER                     |
|                           | ) |                           |
| JOE BURNETTE; TIM KNIGHT, | ) |                           |
|                           | ) |                           |
| Defendants.               | ) |                           |
| _____                     | ) |                           |

Presently before the court is “Plaintiff’s Motion To Compel.” (Doc. #25). In this document, Plaintiff requests this court to issue an order to compel the Defendants to provide him with certain information. Defendants filed a response in opposition asserting Plaintiff has never served Defendants with the discovery which he now complains they have failed to answer. Defendants further point out that in his Motion to Compel, Plaintiff indicates that he requested the discovery from certain persons/entity which are not parties to this lawsuit.

Generally, this court does not enter the discovery process, which is governed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiff may seek discovery from the Defendants and/or non-parties in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See* Rules 26 through 37, 45 generally and in compliance with the court’s scheduling order. It does not appear that he served the discovery on the parties to this action. Thus, Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III  
Thomas E. Rogers, III  
United States Magistrate Judge

November 5, 2013  
Florence, South Carolina