

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

CHARLES E. HENNINGS,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVE DITTER (BSI),

Defendant.

ORDER

06-C-353-C

Before the court is plaintiff's January 30, 2007 letter in which he complains that defendant's counsel is "denying my demand for discovery, request for admissions and request for interrogatories." *See* *dk.* 10. This prompted defendant to file with the court his actual discovery responses, a stack of documents 1 1/4" tall. *See* *dk.* 11. These documents demonstrate that defendant answered all of plaintiff's discovery demands. Sometimes the answer was a set of objections, but defendant has not stonewalled plaintiff as implied in his letter.

It is not this court's job to determine the general adequacy of defendant's discovery responses in the absence of a more specific showing by plaintiff that he is entitled to something more than he got. If plaintiff has a specific problem with a specific response or group of responses to his discovery demands, then he must file a motion that specifies the problem and provides his argument(s) as to why he is entitled to more information than he received.

To the extent that the court has construed plaintiff's letter as a motion to compel discovery, the motion is denied as unsupported.

Entered this 15th day of February, 2007.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge