

2009—clearly past the thirty-day deadline. Defendant does not even attempt to show good cause for an extension of the deadline.

Second, even if the motion to compel were timely, it is substantively inadequate. Defendant has provided no persuasive argument as to why the objections to interrogatories and deposition questions were improper.²

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 30th day of July, 2009, at Kansas City, Kansas.

s/James P. O'Hara
James P. O'Hara
U.S. Magistrate Judge

²In its reply brief, defendant suggests that it need not submit an argument on the improper nature of plaintiff's interrogatory objections because the burden of proof was on plaintiff to substantiate the objections. However, where an interrogatory does not, on its face, appear to seek relevant information, the burden is on the requester to show relevancy before a motion to compel will be granted. *Delkhah v. Moore*, No. 04-2543, 2006 WL 681119, at *2 (D. Kan. March 14, 2006).