

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

AKOV ORTIZ, :
Plaintiff, :
 :
v. : CASE NO: 3:11cv1793(SRU) (WIG)
 :
LEO ARONONE, :
Defendant. :

RULING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL [Doc. #28]

The plaintiff moves to compel responses to his April 2, 2012 interrogatories/requests for production.

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.

The plaintiff has not demonstrated compliance with any of these requirements. Thus, his motion to compel [Doc. #28] is **DENIED.**

SO ORDERED at Bridgeport, Connecticut this 25th day of September 2012.

/s/ William I. Garfinkel
William I. Garfinkel
United States Magistrate Judge