

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

Jimmy G. Gilchrist (SCDC No. 242834),	)	C/A No. 5:11-1746-MBS-KDW
	)	
	Plaintiff,	)
	)	
vs.	)	
	)	ORDER
Eliane Pinson; John Doe #1; Mrs. Greer; Gregory	)	
Nolan; John Doe #2; John Doe #3; Tessie Smith;	)	
Mr. Kammerer; Ms. Coleman; all in their official	)	
and individual capacities,	)	
	)	
	Defendants.	)

---

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, seeks relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's motion to compel, to which Defendants filed a response. ECF Nos. 45, 46. Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1)(B), and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., this magistrate judge is authorized to review all pretrial matters in cases filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On January 12, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel production of documents he requested from Defendants on October 27, 2011. ECF No. 45. On January 17, 2012, Defendants responded to Plaintiff's motion, explaining as follows:

Due to the Plaintiff's pending max-out from prison (on December 1, 2011) and the looming Thanksgiving holidays, the Defendants held Plaintiff's discovery responses until they received Plaintiff's forwarding address. On December 7, 2011, the Plaintiff filed his Change of Address with the Court. Shortly thereafter, on January 11, 2012, the Defendants respond[ed] to Plaintiff's discovery, attaching 430 documents in response to the same.

ECF No. 46 at 1-2.

Defendants provided the court with a copy of their written responses to the discovery at issue. ECF No. 46-1. Plaintiff has not responded to Defendants' assertion that they

complied with his discovery requests. As it appears Defendants now have fully responded to Plaintiff's discovery requests, Plaintiff's motion to compel, ECF No. 45, is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



March 14, 2012  
Florence, South Carolina

Kaymani D. West  
United States Magistrate Judge