

1 wo

2

3

4

5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8

9 William Knowles,

No. CV-08-01283-PHX-ROS

10 Plaintiff,

ORDER

11 vs.

12

13 U.S. Foodservice, Inc., et al.,

14

15 Defendants.

16

17 Before the Court is the parties' Joint Statement of Discovery Dispute. (Doc. 98).
18 Plaintiff seeks an order requiring Defendant to supplement its responses to discovery
19 requests. In interrogatories and a deposition of a witness, Plaintiff asked for the identity of
20 any person assuming the route duties held by Plaintiff during his employment. Defendant
21 responded by identifying the drivers who had assumed Plaintiff's route duties. Plaintiff does
22 not dispute that Defendant's response was complete and accurate at the time it was made, as
23 Defendant named every individual who had assumed Plaintiff's route duties. But Plaintiff
24 believes that since that time, another individual has been hired by Defendant to assume
25 Plaintiff's former route.

26

27 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(e)(2)(A) requires a party to supplement an
28 interrogatory "if the party learns that in some material respect the disclosure or response is
incomplete or incorrect" Defendant argues it has no duty to supplement its response
because its response was complete and accurate when it was made. Defendant argues its

