

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

FELTON ADAM ROBICHAUX

CIVIL ACTION

VERSUS

NUMBER: 22-610

HUNTINGTON INGALLS INCORPORATED, ET AL.

SECTION: "P"(5)

ORDER AND REASONS ON MOTION
AUGUST 31, 2023

APPEARANCES:

MOTION:

(1) Plaintiff's Motion for Discovery Sanctions Against Huntington Ingalls, Inc. Pursuant to Rule 37(b) (rec. doc. 409)

_____: Continued to

_____: No opposition.

 1 : Opposition. (Rec. doc. 412).

ORDERED


_____: Dismissed as moot.

_____: Dismissed for failure of counsel to appear.

_____: Granted.

 1 : Denied as moot. As for the request for sanctions, including dispositive sanctions, the conduct here does not even approach the level that would justify such a sanction. While Defense counsel admittedly acted in a dilatory fashion in communicating with Plaintiff's counsel as to the scheduling of the subject deposition, the Court can divine no prejudice to Plaintiff in the delay occasioned by that conduct. Indeed, a date for that deposition has been offered and accepted, a notice issued, and Plaintiff has not taken issue in a reply memorandum with Defendant's position that the matter is moot. It is not entirely clear why Plaintiff felt compelled to file this motion in the first place, given that Defendant's counsel actually did respond to counsel's request for a deposition date a week before the motion was filed.

_____: Other.



MICHAEL B. NORTH
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE