

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

NATHAN GILLIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

RICK RAEMISCH, *et al.*

Defendants.

ORDER

09-cv-245-bbc

Plaintiff Nathan Gillis, a prisoner at the Columbia Correctional Institution, is proceeding on various claims of due process, First & Eighth Amendment and RLUIPA violations.

Before the court is plaintiff's motion to compel responses to discovery requests, *see* dkt. 67, supplemented by dkt. 77-78. In his motion, plaintiff moves to compel responses to his first set of interrogatories Nos. 1-5; his first set of request for production of documents (RFPs) 1-5, 7-20, 22 and 23; his first set of requests for admissions (RFAs), 20; his second set of interrogatories and production of documents Nos. 1-5; and his second set of RFAs 12, 20-23, 25, 31, 42-44 and 46. Although plaintiff says that the discovery requests and a letter from Ms. Potts are attached to his motion, the court never received these documents. Further, plaintiff does not explain why the discovery responses he has received are insufficient, as he is required to do by the preliminary pretrial conference order, *see* dkt. 46 at 10.

In the defendants' detailed 12-page response to the motion (dkt. 1010), they group their responses to the requests in two sections: (1) those for which they assert plaintiff received complete responses and (2) those to which they object. First, for the first set of interrogatories 1-5; first request for RFPs 1-3, 9-10, 14, 18-20 and 23; second set of interrogatories and RFPs 1, 2 and 5; and second set of RFAs 22-23, 31 and 46, defendants assert that plaintiff is not

entitled to any more information than he has received. Because plaintiff has not shown otherwise, I will deny his motion to compel responses to these requests.

Second, defendants assert that they have properly objected to plaintiff's remaining requests: first RFPs 4-5, 7-8, 11-13, 15, 17, and 22; first set of RFAs 20; second set of interrogatories and RFP, 3; and second set of RFAs 12, 20-21, 25, 42 and 44. Having reviewed these objections, I find that they are well-taken. Therefore, plaintiff's motion to compel these discovery requests will be denied.

If plaintiff files another discovery motion without providing a proper explanation why the court should grant each part, then the court will deny it without requiring a response from the defendant.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to compel discovery responses, dkt. #67 is DENIED.

Entered this 11th day of June, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge