

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

WILLIAM ARNOLD,
Plaintiff,

v.

DAVID BUCK, et al.,
Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CASE NO. 3:11-cv-1343 (VLB)

RULING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR REIMBURSEMENT

The plaintiff asks the court to order the defendants to share the costs he has incurred to make copies of documents he wishes to file in this case and the postage required for filing the documents.

The plaintiff does not have right to have the defendants pay for copies he wishes to file with the court. Although plaintiff has been granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis in this case, the in forma pauperis statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1915, does not authorize payment of discovery expenses by the defendants. See Benitez v . Choinski, No. 3:05cv633(JCH)(HBF), 2006 WL 276975, at *2 (D. Conn. Feb. 2, 2006) (holding that inmate proceeding in forma pauperis is not entitled to have discovery expenses paid by the court or the defendants)(citing cases). The plaintiff's motion for reimbursement is denied.

The plaintiff also seeks a four-month extension of the discovery period. He states that the extension is required because it will take him that long to copy all of the documents he wishes to send to the court. Although the plaintiff states that the warden will not longer approve additional copies, the documents attached to his motion indicate that the warden has approved every such request.

As the plaintiff has provided no evidence that an extension is required, the request is denied.

The plaintiff's motion for reimbursement [doc. #32] is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/
Vanessa L. Bryant
United States District Judge

Dated at Hartford, Connecticut: July 11, 2012.