

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
OCALA DIVISION**

**ADAM M. DILTS and RACHEL M.
DILTS, Husband**

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No: 5:16-cv-453-Oc-37PRL

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.

Defendant.

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Defendant's motion to compel (Doc. 49). In response, Plaintiffs represent that they have produced (or will soon produce) additional discovery responses and have withdrawn various objections, thus, significantly narrowing the scope of the motion. (Doc. 67).

Now, Defendant seeks leave to file a reply to address Plaintiffs' claim that deficiencies have been cured and to advise the Court of the scope of remaining issues. (Doc. 68). Defendant points out that it has not yet received the supplemental discovery responses that Plaintiffs stated in their response that they would provide so it can evaluate if those issues have been resolved. In addition, Defendant states that prior to filing their response, Plaintiffs had not provided a rationale for their objections. Thus, it appears that the parties have not had a substantive discussion regarding the merits of the disputed discovery.

Because there is uncertainty as to the scope of issues before the Court, I believe that the best course of action is to **terminate** the pending motion to compel (Doc. 49). Defendant's motion for leave to file a reply (Doc. 68) is **GRANTED** to the extent that Plaintiffs are directed to

provide all supplemental discovery responses on or before **January 28, 2017**. If issues still remain, Defendant may file a renewed motion to compel, but only after the parties have conferred in good faith.

DONE and ORDERED in Ocala, Florida on January 25, 2017.



PHILIP R. LAMMENS
United States Magistrate Judge

Copies furnished to:

Counsel of Record
Unrepresented Parties