

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Corey Jawan Robinson,)	C/A No. 5:13-cv-00504-JMC-KDW
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
)	
MD George Amonitti, Practitioner Ms. E)	
Holcomb, Doctor B Awood, and CCC L)	
Fripp,)	
)	
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 filed on July 29, 2013. ECF No. 34. Defendants filed a response opposing Plaintiff’s motion on July 31, 2013, and Plaintiff replied to Defendants’ response on August 7, 2103. ECF Nos. 36, 37. Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 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.

Plaintiff’s motion asks the court to compel Defendants to answer his discovery requests. ECF No. 34 at 1. Defendants oppose Plaintiff’s motion arguing that they mailed their responses to Plaintiff’s discovery requests on July 19, 2013, and Plaintiff “provides no argument regarding the Responses to which the Defendants can formulate a response at this time.” ECF No. 36 at 1. Plaintiff responds to Defendants’ assertion that they timely responded to Plaintiff’s discovery requests and argues that:

[Defendants’ response] did not make no objection of why they could not produce the document requested . . . within the 30 day[] time period. Plaintiff have

provided argument regarding the Responses to which the Defendants can formulate a response, Plaintiff asked the court to grant his motion to compel, because the discovery sought is relevant to the claims and defenses in this case.

ECF No. 37 at 1.

Local Rule 37.01, D.S.C., requires that a party moving to compel discovery responses provide the court with a copy of the discovery requests and responses at issue. Although Plaintiff included the text of the discovery requests in his motion to compel, Plaintiff has not provided the court with a copy of Defendants' responses, and therefore the court cannot determine whether Defendants' discovery responses were adequate. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion to Compel, ECF No. 34, is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Kaymani D. West". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Kaymani D. West
United States Magistrate Judge

August 22, 2013
Florence, South Carolina