

**DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS**

**DIVISION OF ST. CROIX**

**ANITA ROBERTS,**

**Plaintiff,**

**1:08-cv-90**

**v.**

**KMART CORPORATION,**

**Defendant.**

**TO: Lee J. Rohn, Esq.**  
**Eugenio W.A. Geigel-Simounet, Esq.**

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SANCTION**

THIS MATTER came before the Court for consideration upon Plaintiff's Motion For Sanction [sic] For Failure to Comply with the Court's Order Dated February 12, 2010 (Docket No. 51). Defendant filed an opposition to said motion, and Plaintiff filed a reply thereto.<sup>1</sup>

Being advised in the premises and upon due consideration thereof, the Court finds Defendant's supplemental responses insufficient and not in adherence with the Court's order that specifically addressed each discovery request at issue.

---

1. Plaintiff's reply, docketed at number 53, was incorrectly designated as a motion when filed. The Court, yet, again, reminds parties and counsel to be more careful and mindful of choosing the correct event when filing documents with the Court using the ECF system.

*Roberts v. Kmart Corporation*

1:08-cv-90

Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion For Sanction

Page 2

Accordingly, it is now hereby **ORDERED**:

1. Plaintiff's Motion For Sanction [sic] For Failure to Comply with the Court's Order Dated February 12, 2010 (Docket No. 51) is **GRANTED**.
2. Defendant shall serve further supplemental responses, as directed by said Order (Docket No. 48), upon counsel for Plaintiff, on or before **May 21, 2010**
3. Defendant shall pay, on or before May 21, 2010, to counsel for Plaintiff the sum of \$300.00, as and for attorney's fees associated with the filing of the motion for sanctions.

ENTER:

Dated: May 7, 2010

/s/ George W. Cannon, Jr.  
GEORGE W. CANNON, JR.  
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE