

upon renewed motion by defendant, to dismiss this case with prejudice[,]” with the caveat that the deadline would be extended only if the Clerk’s Office had difficulty in locating substitute pro bono counsel for plaintiff. (Id. at 2-3 & n.1)(emphasis in original).

Shortly thereafter, the Clerk’s Office located an attorney willing to represent plaintiff for discovery purposes only (Dkts. ##103-04),¹ following which an in-person status conference was held. (Dkts. ##106-08). During this conference, counsel agreed, and the Court ordered, that all fact discovery (including depositions of all fact witnesses) be completed by January 31, 2017, and that all Motions to Compel with respect to fact discovery be filed by January 31, 2017. (Dkt. #109, ¶¶ 1-2).²

On January 30, 2017, defendant filed the pending Motion to Compel (Dkt. #110),³ as to which plaintiff failed to file a timely brief in opposition under Local Rule 7(a)2. For the reasons stated in defendant’s motion, the motion (Dkt. #110) is granted with respect to Interrogatories Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15 and 17, and Requests for Production Nos. 1, 2 and 3. Plaintiff shall comply **on or before March 22, 2017**. As forewarned in the August 2016 Ruling, if defense counsel does not receive **full and complete** responses

¹Attorney Baldwin is the sixth attorney to represent plaintiff in this litigation in some capacity. See Dkts. ##22 (privately retained counsel); 23 (another privately retained counsel); 32-33, 35, 38 (withdrawal of appearance by one of these attorneys); 39, 41-42 (withdrawal of appearance by the other of these attorneys); 44-46, 51-53 (plaintiff’s request for appointment of pro bono counsel for attorney, Court’s granting of same, and appearances of pro bono counsel for settlement purposes only); 58-60 (withdrawal of appearances by pro bono counsel); 70, 78, 89-90 (regarding appointment of pro bono counsel for all purposes); 99, 102 (withdrawal of pro bono counsel).

See also Dkts. ##36, 69, 73 (regarding pro se appearance).

²In addition, deadlines were set for completing expert discovery and filing dispositive motions. (Id., ¶¶ 3-4).

³Attached was a copy of Plaintiff’s Responses and Objections to Defendant’s First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production to the Plaintiff, sworn to September 16, 2016.

to the pending discovery requests by **March 22, 2017**, the Court will not hesitate, sua sponte, or upon renewed motion by defendant, to dismiss this case with prejudice.

Dated this 28th day of February, 2017, at New Haven, Connecticut.

/s/ Joan G. Margolis, USMJ
Joan Glazer Margolis
United States Magistrate Judge