

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

LANCELOT GORDON, :  
 :  
 Plaintiff, :  
 :  
 v. : CASE NO. 3:06CV1433 (RNC)  
 :  
 THE HOUSING AUTHORITY OF :  
 HARTFORD, ET AL., :  
 :  
 Defendants. :

ORDER

Pending before the court is the defendants' motion to compel discovery responses, doc. #58. Oral argument was held on September 19, 2007.

Interrogatories #13, 20(b), 29, 30(i), 30(n), 31(i), 41(b), 42(k), 42(l), 45, 48(b), 48(g), 49, 71, 72 and 74.

The motion to compel is denied as moot as to these interrogatories in light of the representation of counsel in open court that the dispute has been resolved as to these items.

Interrogatory #26:

The motion to compel is granted as to this interrogatory. The plaintiff shall respond under oath as to whether the meeting was recorded or memorialized.

Interrogatory #30(1):

The motion to compel is granted as to this interrogatory. The plaintiff shall supplement his response under oath to explain what he meant by the phrase "secured the contract through the HHA bidding process" as he used it in paragraph 40 of the First Amended Complaint.

Interrogatory # 32(b):

The motion to compel is granted as to this interrogatory.  
The plaintiff shall supplement his response under oath.

Interrogatory #34(c):

The motion to compel is granted as to this interrogatory.  
The plaintiff shall supplement his response under oath.

Interrogatory #43(a):

The motion to compel is denied.

Interrogatory#53:

At oral argument, the defendants sought an order requiring the plaintiff to respond to subsections (a) and (b). The motion to compel is granted as to those subsections. The plaintiff shall supplement his response to identify each allegedly false and disparaging remark.

Interrogatory #54:

At oral argument, the defendants conceded that only subsections (a) and (b) were at issue. The plaintiff shall supplement his response to identify each instance of the plaintiff's allegedly protected speech and each instance of retaliation.

Interrogatory #55:

The motion to compel is granted as to this interrogatory.  
The plaintiff shall supplement his response under oath.

Interrogatory #56:

The motion to compel is granted as to this interrogatory.

The plaintiff shall supplement his response under oath.

Interrogatory #57(a) and (e):

The defendants represented at oral argument that the only items in contention are descriptions of the plaintiff's job duties in each position, his benefits, and any bonuses received. The plaintiff argued that he has provided all the information that he remembers. The plaintiff shall supplement his response under oath, bearing in mind that in responding to interrogatories, a party is required to make a reasonable inquiry to ensure that the response is complete and correct. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(g).

Interrogatories 60-64:

The motion to compel is denied as moot as to these interrogatories in light of the agreement reached by counsel in open court on September 19, 2007.

Interrogatories 67-70:

The motion to compel is denied as to these interrogatories.

Requests for Production:

The motion to compel is granted as to the requests for production. The plaintiff shall supplement his responses as discussed during oral argument.

SO ORDERED at Hartford, Connecticut this 20<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2007.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Donna F. Martinez  
United States Magistrate Judge