

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 in this prisoner civil rights lawsuit is plaintiff's second motion to compel discovery. *See* dkt. 24. The state has responded by providing a copy of its discovery responses and standing by them.

On February 15, 2007, I denied plaintiff's first letter-motion to compel (dkt. 10), observing that:

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.

Dkt. 12 at 1.

Plaintiff's current motion is well-typed but still vague and misdirected. Plaintiff's only specific complaint is that "defendant continually claims the ICRS material is privileged information, and as such, will not provide it." Dkt. 24 at 2. Plaintiff refers the court generally to his 3-page discovery request and defendant's 9-page response. Honing in a bit, plaintiff states

his belief that “giving the names of the inmates that filed ICI complaints against Ditter, violates nothing,” followed by a self-contradicting citation to DOC 310 IMP 1, which states that DOC will ensure the confidentiality of ICRS complaints. Plaintiff notes that DOC can waive complaint confidentiality if the security, safety or health of any person is involved. *Id.* But plaintiff does not explain how security, safety or health are involved in his claim that defendant caused plaintiff not to get his job back after plaintiff successfully appealed the findings of the adjustment committee on charges of misusing BSI copying equipment. Neither has plaintiff explained why this information is relevant to his claim and therefore discoverable. In short, plaintiff has provided no actual support for this portion of his motion to compel.

Plaintiff then throws in a kitchen-sink allegation that “defendant’s response to plaintiff’s discovery demand dated 11-30-06, are just as faulty as the above arguments apply to B1-B9 exhibits.” *Id.* at 3. My February 15 admonition to plaintiff applies with equal force to this allegation.

It is ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion to compel discovery is DENIED.

Entered this 8th day of March, 2007.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge