

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
HARRISON DIVISION

SCOTT HAMMOND

PLAINTIFF

v.

No. 3:12-cv-03103

CHAD HURST, in his official capacity only; and
MEEKS THE BUILDERS CHOICE

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

Currently before the Court are Plaintiff's motion (Doc. 28) to compel and Plaintiff's motion (Doc. 32) to exclude.

Plaintiff filed a document (Doc. 28) on August 13, 2013 that the Court construed as containing, in part, a motion to compel. In relevant part, Plaintiff claimed that he combined his Rule 26 disclosures and his request for documents and that Defendants were refusing to answer his request for documents. It appears to the Court that the parties subsequently conferred via telephone and worked out the relevant issues. Plaintiff maintains in his reply (Doc. 35) that there are still unresolved issues, but only cites to an issue involving receiving paperwork showing that Defendants had changed counsel. It does not appear to the Court that Defendants have been unforthcoming or secretive as to who defense counsel is. Defendants have filed a certificate of service, on all notices of appearance and withdrawals of appearance, listing Plaintiff as having been served. The Court therefore ORDERS that Plaintiff's motion (Doc. 28) to compel is DENIED.

Plaintiff moves to exclude "Actions of the Past of Plaintiff and Defendants Prior to Jan 1, 2002." (Doc. 32). It appears that Plaintiff's request is an attempt to limit discovery. His argument that such evidence is irrelevant is too general to preclude discovery of such a broad category of potential evidence at this stage. Plaintiff should make specific objections to Defendants' discovery

requests (to the Defendants). If Defendants believe that Plaintiff's objections are not valid, Defendants can then file a motion to compel. The Court ORDERS that Plaintiff's motion (Doc. 32) to exclude is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 13th day of September, 2013.

P. K. Holmes, III

P.K. HOLMES, III
CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE