

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

RICHARD H. WARREN,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
STATE OF WASHINGTON,  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,  
STAFFORD CREEK CORRECTIONS  
CENTER, ERIC JACKSON, DAN  
VAN OGLE, PAT GLEBE, CUS  
SHANAHAN, WILLIAM COPLAND,  
and ABRAM CLARK,  
  
Defendants.

No. C11-5686 BHS/KLS  
  
ORDER DENYING “OBJECTIONS” TO  
DISCOVERY

On April 2 and 5, 2012, Plaintiff filed “Objections and Responses to Defendants’  
Objections, Answers, and Responses” to discovery. ECF Nos. 39 and 40. Within these  
documents, Plaintiff asks the Court, *inter alia*, to compel the Defendants to provide complete and  
entire responses to his discovery requests. These documents were not filed as motions to compel  
and neither document contained a certification by Plaintiff that he has conferred with counsel for  
Defendants in an attempt to resolve any discovery dispute.

While a party may apply to the court for an order compelling discovery “upon reasonable  
notice to other parties and all persons affected thereby,” the motion must also include a  
certification that the movant has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the person or  
party failing to make the discovery in an effort to secure the information or material without

1 court intervention.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(2)(B). In addition, “[a] good faith effort to confer with  
2 a party or person not making a disclosure or discovery requires a face-to-face meeting or a  
3 telephonic conference.” Local Rule CR 37(a)(2)(A).

4 The Court anticipates that the parties will confer and make a good faith effort to resolve  
5 any discovery disputes without Court interference. If the parties cannot amicably resolve this  
6 issue, Plaintiff may file a motion to compel, and shall include a certification stating that their  
7 efforts were unsuccessful, and shall identify those areas of disagreement that remain unresolved.  
8 The Court will not address any motion which lacks such a certification.  
9

10 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

11 (1) The Court will take no action on the documents filed at ECF Nos. 39 and 40.

12 (2) The Clerk of the Court shall send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff and to counsel  
13 for Defendants.  
14

15 **DATED** this 12th day of April, 2012.

16  
17   
18 Karen L. Strombom  
19 United States Magistrate Judge  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26