

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

-----  
PATRICIA WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT,  
DELORA NEWTON, ENID GLENN, KARL DAHLEN,  
SHERI POLLOCK, JOSEPH LEDGER and ANDRE SMALL,

Defendants.  
-----

OPINION AND ORDER

17-cv-253-bbc

-----  
PATRICIA WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT,  
JOSEPH LEDGER and ANDRE SMALL,

Defendants.  
-----

OPINION AND ORDER

17-cv-254-bbc

-----  
PATRICIA WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT,  
KARL DAHLEN, SHERRI POLLOCK, MEREDITH DRESSEL,  
NICHOLAS LAMPONE, ENID GLENN and DELORI NEWTON,

Defendants.  
-----

OPINION AND ORDER

17-cv-255-bbc

In these three consolidated cases, pro se plaintiff Patricia Williams is suing the Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development and several of its employees for discriminating and retaliating against her in various ways. Now before the court are several motions filed by plaintiff regarding discovery. Dkt. ##31, 32, 33, 37. (Citations are to docket numbers in case number 17-cv-253-bbc, unless otherwise specified.) I am denying all of plaintiff's motions.

In her first set of motions, filed November 27, 2017, plaintiff filed a motion to compel responses to her discovery requests, dkt. #31, and a motion for admissions to be deemed admitted, dkt, #32. However, her requests fail at the outset because plaintiff has not submitted evidence that defendants' discovery responses are untimely or that she attempted to confer in good faith with defendants to resolve the disputes before filing her motions. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1).

Next, plaintiff filed a motion for sanctions based on defendants' alleged failure to provide discovery. Dkt. #33. However, plaintiff has not shown that defendants failed to timely respond to any properly served discovery requests.

Finally, on December 20, 2017, plaintiff filed a "motion for objection and missing discovery," in which she alleges that defendants have provided her no discovery at all. Dkt. #37. However, plaintiff has again failed to provide any detailed explanation of what discovery requests she served on defendants, when she served them and why she believes defendants' responses are untimely. She has also failed to show that she conferred in good faith with defendants before filing her motion. Accordingly, I am denying all of plaintiff's motions.

In the future, plaintiff should review Rule 37 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Preliminary Pretrial Conference Order, dkt. #25, and should confer with defendants' counsel before filing any discovery-related motions with the court. If plaintiff continues to file frivolous and unsupported motions, I will consider imposing monetary or other sanctions against plaintiff for wasting the court's and defendants' counsel's time and resources.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Patricia Williams's "motion to attach requested discovery," "motion for admissions to be deemed admitted," "motion for sanctions" and "motion for objection and missing discovery" (dkt. ##31, 32, 33, 37 in case no. 17-cv-253-bbc; dkt. ##36, 37, 38, 42 in case no. 17-cv-254-bbc; dkt. ##30, 31, 32, 36 in case no. 17-cv-255-bbc), are DENIED.

Entered this 28th day of December, 2017.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

---

BARBARA B. CRABB  
District Judge