

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
ORLANDO DIVISION**

BRADLEY DANTZLER-CAMPBELL,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 6:23-cv-1992-CEM-LHP

JEANNE T. ANDERSON,

Defendant

ORDER

This cause came on for consideration without oral argument on the following motion filed herein:

**MOTION: DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO COMPEL
PLAINTIFF’S RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT’S
INITIAL DISCOVERY (Doc. No. 18)**

FILED: January 24, 2024

THEREON it is ORDERED that the motion is DENIED without prejudice.

Defendant moves for the Court to compel Plaintiff to provide answers to Defendant’s first set of interrogatories and requests for production. Doc. No. 18. According to the Local Rule 3.01(g) certification, defense counsel “conferred with

counsel for Plaintiff, Bradley Dantzler-Campbell, in a good faith effort to resolve the Motion via both email correspondence and telephone conversation on January 22, 2024 and Plaintiff's counsel indicated she has reached out for but has not received responses from her client." *Id.*, at 3. Given the ambiguous nature of this statement, it appears that the supplemental conferral requirements of Local Rule 3.01(g)(3) apply, however Defendant has not supplemented the conferral certification. See Local Rule 3.01(g)(3) (providing that if the opposing party is unavailable for a conference prior to filing a motion, the movant must diligently attempt contact for three days, and upon contact or expiration of the three-day period, the movant must file a supplement to the motion, and that failure to supplement can result in the denial of a motion without prejudice). Accordingly, the above-styled motion (Doc. No. 18) is **DENIED without prejudice**.

DONE and ORDERED in Orlando, Florida on January 30, 2024.



LESLIE HOFFMAN PRICE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Copies furnished to:

Counsel of Record
Unrepresented Parties