

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MISSOURI, SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION**

Dillonger J. Majors v. Jacob Reeves, et al.

Majors · No. 1:24-cv-00233-SNLJ · Decided February 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri denied plaintiff Dillonger J. Majors’s motion to compel discovery. The court held that the motion failed to satisfy Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37 and Local Rule 3.04 because it lacked the required certification of a good-faith conference and did not provide sufficient information about the discovery sought.

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION DILLONGER J. MAJORS,)) Plaintiff,)) vs.) Case No. 1:24-cv-
00233-SNLJ) JACOB REEVES, et al.,)) Defendants.) MEMORANDUM AND ORDER This
matter is before the Court on plaintiff’s motion to compel discovery [Doc. 51].

For the following reasons, the motion must be denied. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37, a motion to compel “must include a certification that the movant has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the person or party failing to make disclosure or discovery in an effort to obtain it without court action.” Fed.R.Civ.Proc. 37(a)(1). Similarly, Local Rule 3.04 provides: The Court will not consider any motion relating to discovery and disclosure unless it contains a statement that [plaintiff] has conferred in person or by telephone with [defendants’] counsel in good faith or has made reasonable efforts to do so, but that after sincere efforts to resolve their dispute, [they] are unable to reach an accord.

This statement also shall recite the date, time and manner of such conference, and the names of the individuals participating therein, or shall state with specificity the efforts made to confer with [defendants’] counsel. Plaintiff has not complied with Rule 37 or Local Rule 3.04.

The Court recognizes that plaintiff’s incarceration makes conferring with defendants’ counsel in person or by telephone difficult, if not impossible. However, plaintiff can communicate in writing with defendants’ counsel, which would be sufficient. Pro se litigants are not excused from complying with substantive and procedural law. *Burgs v. Sissel*, 745 F.2d 526, 528 (8th Cir.

1984). Furthermore, plaintiff has not provided enough information for the Court to order the production of any documents or other evidence. He has not provided a copy of the discovery in question or any details about when it was served on the defendants.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to compel discovery [Doc. 51] is DENIED. SO ORDERED this 5th day of February, 2026. STEPHEN N. LIMBAUGH, “ SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-missouri-southeastern-division-united-state/2026/dillonger-j-majors-v-jacob-reeves-et-al-n5dx7de0>