

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

DAVID ABRAMS,
Plaintiff,

v.

COUNSELOR SCRIBINSKI, et al.,
Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CASE NO. 3:14-cv-56 (JCH)

MARCH 24, 2015

RULING ON MOTION TO COMPEL

The plaintiff states that he mailed interrogatories and requests for production of documents to defendants Scribinski, Claudio and Guadarrama on July 29, 2014. On September 26, 2014, plaintiff received defendants' responses to these discovery requests. The plaintiff claims that the defendants' responses to some of the interrogatories were inadequate or evasive and the objections to these interrogatories were baseless. In addition, all three defendants refused to respond to some of the requests for production of documents.

Local Rule 37(b)1 requires that any discovery motion filed with the court be accompanied by a detailed memorandum containing the specific items of discovery sought or opposed. Rule 37(b)1 provides in pertinent part:

Memoranda by both sides shall be filed with the Clerk in accordance with Rule 7(a)1 of these Local Rules before any discovery motion is heard by the Court. Each memorandum shall contain a concise statement of the nature of the case and a specific verbatim listing of each of the items of discovery sought or opposed, and immediately following each specification shall set forth the reason why the item should be allowed or disallowed. . . . Every memorandum shall include, as exhibits, copies of the discovery requests in dispute.

D. Conn. L. Civ. R. 37(b)1.

The plaintiff has filed a Memorandum in support of his Motion to Compel and has attached his discovery requests and the defendants' responses to some of those requests. He has not, however, set forth the reasons why each of the requested items of discovery should be allowed. While the plaintiff makes a number of conclusory arguments – describing the defendants' responses to his discovery requests as “evasive,” “baseless,” “fabricated,” and other similar terms – the plaintiff does not explain why the defendants' responses are improper beyond the use of mere labels. More fundamentally, the plaintiff does not explain why the discovery material that the defendant allegedly avoided producing is within the scope of discovery in the first instance. Thus, the plaintiff did not comply with the provisions of Local Rule 37(b)1. Accordingly, the Motion to Compel is denied.

Conclusion

The plaintiff's Motion to Compel **[Doc. No. 29]** is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED at New Haven, Connecticut, this 24th day of March, 2015.

/s/ Janet C. Hall
Janet C. Hall
United States District Judge