

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

RAYMOND BRESETTE, #217468,

Plaintiff,

v.

OFFICER STEVE KNUDSEN, *et al.*,

Defendants.

ORDER

06-C-280-C

Plaintiff has filed a series of unfounded motions of this case. The court addressed the most recent set in a January 5, 2007 order (dkt. 55) that re-characterized one of plaintiff's motion for entry of default (dkt. 45) as a motion to compel discovery. *See* dkt. 55 at 3. The court allowed defendants to respond; defendants timely did so and have claim that they have answered all of plaintiff's discovery requests. *See* dkts. 56-57.

Plaintiff claims that he still does not have a copy of any applicable insurance policy, and he does not have the disciplinary records of the defendants. Defendants claimed back in October that they were providing this policy. Defendants objected to providing the disciplinary records and plaintiff has not established any specific need for them here. I do not know why there is a disagreement over the insurance policy. If defendants already have provided it, they should advise the court when this happened (it's not included in Exh. A to their current response). If they have not provided it as promised, they had better do so forthwith, with a cover letter to the court, so that it can fashion an appropriate sanction (which would *not* include dismissal.)

As for the disciplinary records, although they might be relevant here, this court does not ordinarily require government employees to disclose documents from their personnel file to detained or incarcerated litigants absent a showing of relevance. Plaintiff has not made any specific argument as to why this court should overrule the defendants' objection and this court will not speculate as to what proper use plaintiff might wish to put the requested records. Therefore, I am denying plaintiff's motion without prejudice.

On January 11, 2007 this court received plaintiff's January 3, 2007 mutation of this same motion to compel, again fashioned as a motion for default judgment. *See* dkt. 58. Plaintiff is no more entitled to relief on this motion than on the last. Why plaintiff would file this motion before obtaining a ruling on his previous motion is puzzling. All I can say at this point is that, in the absence of new facts or argument, there is no reason for the court to grant this motion, either.

ORDER

It is ORDERED that plaintiff's two pending motions for "discovery" (dkts. 45 and 58) are DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that not later than January 23, 2007, defendants shall provide confirmation to the court that they have disclosed to plaintiff any insurance policies responsive to his discovery requests.

Signed: January 14, 2007.

BY THE COURT:
/s/
STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge