

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

JEFFREY DeANGELIS,  
Plaintiff,

v.

MONICA FARINELLA, et al.,  
Defendants.

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

CASE NO. 3:16-cv-307 (MPS)

MARCH 10, 2017

**RULING ON MOTIONS TO COMPEL [ECF Nos. 34, 35]**

The plaintiff has filed two motions seeking to compel discovery responses in this case. In the first motion, Plaintiff states that some of the responses refer him to medical records written by Dr. Figura but her handwriting is difficult to read. In addition, he disputes the accuracy of some of defendant Figura's responses. Plaintiff asks the Court to order defendant Figura to re-answer the interrogatories. In the second motion, Plaintiff seeks responses to his June 20, 2016 discovery requests.

Motions to compel are governed by Rule 37 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and District of Connecticut Local Rule 37. Both the federal and local rules require 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 Doe v. Mastoloni*, 307 F.R.D. 305, 313 (D. Conn. 2015). If discussions are not successful, the local rule requires the party moving to compel to submit an affidavit certifying the attempted resolution and specifying which issues were resolved and which remain. D. Conn. L. Civ. R. 37(a). Local Rule 37(b)1 requires the moving party to file a memorandum containing a concise statement of the nature of the case, a specific verbatim

