

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

8	JERARDO RODRIGUEZ,)	
)	
9	Plaintiff,)	Case No. C16-778-RAJ
)	
10	v.)	ORDER
)	
11	SOHI HEMIT, et al.,)	
)	
12	Defendants.)	
13)	

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel. Dkt. # 46. Plaintiff argues that Defendants have not produced the identities of individuals with whom Plaintiff conversed telephonically. *Id.* Defendants respond that they have produced this information and have submitted supplements as additional information becomes available. Dkt. # 51.

It appears that Plaintiff is not satisfied with how Defendants are responding to his discovery requests. But Plaintiff’s understanding of the purported telephone records is based on speculation. To be sure, the Court appreciates the parties’ ongoing communications and attempts to work together. However, the Court does not find that Defendants are withholding information in their possession. Of course, the Court will continue to expect Defendants to supplement their discovery responses to Plaintiff as new information surfaces.

ORDER-1

1 For these reasons, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion. Dkt. # 46. In the future,
2 Plaintiff may move this Court to compel Defendants to produce information if Plaintiff can
3 point to articulable facts evidencing Defendants' possession of relevant records that are
4 being improperly withheld. The Court does not find that the record supports such a
5 conclusion—or even an inference—at this time.

6 Dated this 1st day of March, 2018.

7 

8 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
9 United States District Judge