

At issue in this motion are fourteen Interrogatories and eighteen Requests for Production, namely Interrogatories Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17 and 19, and Requests for Production Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22 and 23. (Dkt. #75, Brief, at 3-24; Dkt. #83, at 1-10; Dkt. #84, at 2-10).³ Plaintiff complied with Requests for Production Nos. 3 and 4 at his recent deposition in New Hampshire. (Dkt. #83, at 7).

Plaintiff has represented that he is seeking additional responses to Interrogatories No. 2, 3, 4, and 11 (Dkt. #83, at 1-3, 4); plaintiff shall provide complete answers **on or before September 10, 2015**.

The Magistrate Judge agrees that plaintiff's responses are insufficient with respect to Interrogatories Nos. 7, 8, 9 and 10, and Request for Production Nos. 12, 13, 14 and 15, and plaintiff shall provide complete answers **on or before September 10, 2015**.

With respect to Interrogatories No. 6, 12, 15, 16, 17 and 19, and Requests for Production Nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22 and 23, plaintiff shall provide supplemental responses, signed by him, instead of his attorney's explanation in a brief (see Dkt. #83, at 3-9), **on or before September 10, 2015**.

This is not a Recommended Ruling, but a ruling on a non-dispositive motion, the standard of review of which is specified in 28 U.S.C. § 636; FED. R. CIV. P. 6(a), 6(e) & 72; and Rule 72.2 of the Local Rules for United States Magistrate Judges. As such, it is an order of the Court unless reversed or modified by the District Judge upon timely made objection.

See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(**written objections to ruling must be filed within fourteen calendar days after service of same**); FED. R. CIV. P. 6(a), 6(e) & 72; Rule

³With all deference to counsel, these are discovery issues that mature adults should have been able to resolve between themselves, without burdening the Court.

72.2 of the Local Rules for United States Magistrate Judges, United States District Court for the District of Connecticut; Small v. Secretary, H&HS, 892 F.2d. 15, 16 (2d Cir. 1989)(failure to file timely objection to Magistrate Judge's recommended ruling may preclude further appeal to Second Circuit).⁴

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut, this 25th day of August, 2015.

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

⁴If any counsel believes that a continued settlement conference before this Magistrate Judge would be productive, he should contact this Magistrate Judge's Chambers accordingly.