

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

JAMES FASOLI,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF STAMFORD, ERNEST ORGERA,
MICHAEL SCACCO, and MICHAEL
LAROBINA

Defendants.

3:11-CV-00767 (CSH)

ORDER

Plaintiff's Motion [Doc. 135] to Compel compliance by Defendant City of Stamford with respect to Plaintiff's prior document production requests is DENIED AS MOOT. Plaintiff's motion was filed on June 20, 2013. Under the Court's prior scheduling orders, Defendant City had until June 28, 2013 to comply with outstanding discovery requests. On June 28, 2013, counsel for the City state without contradiction, the City produced quantities of documents in response to Plaintiff's demands. Plaintiff's motion to compel was premature.¹

At earlier stages in this contentious case, a number of discovery-related or dispositive motions were made by one party or another. The litigation proceeded apace, and it would seem that these earlier motions have also been mooted. The present scheduling order provides that all Defendants must file any dispositive motions by September 3, 2013. The earlier motions bear

¹ The caption to Plaintiff's motion contains a reference to Defendant's "refusal to produce officer at deposition." The Court disregards that reference as inadvertent, since the text of Plaintiff's brief [Doc. 135-1] contains no reference to a deposition problem, and the file indicates that deposition problems were worked out by the parties at earlier stages in the case.

Docket Numbers 93, 95, 100, 102,106, 108, and 117. Each of these motions is DENIED AS MOOT. If any party considers that any of these motions should be further addressed before September 3, 2013, counsel should file an appropriate application.

It is SO ORDERED.

Dated: New Haven, Connecticut
August 7, 2013

/s/Charles S. Haight, Jr.
Charles S. Haight, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge