

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

JOSHUA RAMOS,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	CASE NO: 3:11cv679 (DJS)
	:	
MICHAEL LAJOIE, et al.,	:	
Defendant.	:	

RULING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL [Doc. #24]

The plaintiff moves to compel responses to his February 2012 interrogatories.

Motions to compel are governed by Rule 37 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the District of Connecticut Local Civil Rules. The local rule requires that, before filing a motion to compel, the moving party must confer with opposing counsel in a good faith effort to resolve the dispute. The purpose of this rule is to encourage the parties to resolve discovery disputes without court intervention. See Hanton v. Price, No. 3:04cv473(CFD), 2006 WL 581204, at \*1 (D. Conn. Mar. 8, 2006). If discussions are not successful, the party moving to compel must submit an affidavit certifying the attempted resolution and specifying which issues were resolved and which remain. In addition, Local Rule 37(b)1 requires that copies of the discovery requests must be included as exhibits.

Although the plaintiff has attached a copy of the interrogatories to his motion, he has not demonstrated compliance with any of other requirements.

In addition, the remaining defendant correctly states that he was granted an extension of time, until thirty days after the court ruled on his motion to dismiss to respond to outstanding discovery. The plaintiff filed his motion to compel before this period had expired. Also, the only remaining defendant is Joshua Trifone. Thus, he is the only person to whom interrogatories may be directed.

The plaintiff's motion to compel [Doc. #24] is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED** at Hartford, Connecticut this 11th day of December 2012.

/s/ Thomas P. Smith  
Thomas P. Smith  
United States Magistrate Judge