

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

---

BRANDEN SUSTMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

STEVE WATTERS, *et al.*,

Defendants.

---

ORDER

06-C-293-C

Plaintiff has filed a motion and demand for discovery (dkt. 22) “subject to plaintiffs’ [*sic*] challenges, if any, to the court’s jurisdiction.” (*Id.* at ¶ 10). The state has provided a more thorough response than it needed to (although the court appreciates the thought). *See* dkt. 24. Plaintiff’s motion is an aggregation of discovery demands and random pronouncements. This court’s August 18, 2006 preliminary pretrial conference order explained to plaintiff how to obtain discovery from defendants. *See* dkt. 7 at 8-11. This court re-emphasized these points in a September 12, 2006 order. *See* dkt. 10. Plaintiff has not followed any of these requirements and therefore is not entitled to a discovery order from the court. Plaintiff’s various pronouncements require no court action.

Accordingly, plaintiff’s motion is DENIED in its entirety.

Entered this 29<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2007.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER

Magistrate Judge