

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

MARKUS GRANSBERRY,

Plaintiff,

v.

DR. SULIENE, L. ALSUM and
SGT. FRIEND,

Defendants.

ORDER

09-cv-730-bbc

Plaintiff is proceeding on claims that defendants failed to provide him adequate medical treatment in violation of the Eight Amendment. Before the court is plaintiff's motion to compel answers to interrogatories, dkt. 64, and motion to supplement his motion to compel, dkt. 65.

In plaintiff's first motion, he asks that defendants be compelled to answer his first set of interrogatories. Defendant's counsel responds that he provided the original answers to plaintiff on July 7 and supplemental responses on July 15, but he concedes that he inadvertently did not sign the supplemental responses. He corrected the oversight on August 31, 2010.

In his supplement to the motion to compel, plaintiff contends that the defendants' responses are identical and that an employee of the department of corrections notarized the responses. The facts that the responses are identical and notarized by a co-employee do not make the responses invalid.

Because defendants have adequately responded to plaintiff's first set of interrogatories, his motion to compel will be denied. Further, there is no basis for plaintiff's request for summary judgment as a sanction because defendants have complied with discovery.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to compel responses to his first set of interrogatories as supplemented, dkts. 64 and 65, is DENIED.

Entered this 7th day of September, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge