

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

MERIDIAN FINANCIAL ADVISORS LTD,	)	
d/b/a THE MERIDIAN GROUP, as Receiver	)	
for OCMC, INC.,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	1:07-cv-995-LJM-TAB
	)	
JOSEPH A. PENCE, et al.,	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO STRIKE  
DEFENDANT PENCE’S DISCOVERY REQUESTS**


Plaintiff moves to strike Defendant Pence’s March 30, 2011, discovery requests generally seeking information about Plaintiff’s attorney’s fees. [Docket No. 522.] Defendant opposes Plaintiff’s motion in part because Plaintiff has not yet responded to his requests in any way. Defendant also questions Plaintiff’s meet-and-confer attempt, which Defendant characterizes as simply a demand that he withdraw his discovery altogether.

Defendant’s position is correct and is consistent with the Court’s previous requirement that Defendant respond to Plaintiff’s discovery with objections. [Docket No. 530 at 5 n.3.] Plaintiff describes the discovery requests at issue with terms such as “outrageous” and “inappropriate.” [Docket No. 522 at 2.] Even if these descriptions ultimately prove to be accurate, firing off a motion to strike in response to a discovery request is not appropriate. *See Meharg v. I-Flow Corp.*, No. 1:08-cv-000184-DFH-TAB, 2009 WL 1867696, at \*1 n.2 (S.D. Ind. June 26, 2009) (“In addition to the fact that the Court is vexed by the number of overlapping and bellicose discovery motions filed . . . in this case, ‘motions to strike are disfavored . . . because they potentially serve only to delay.’”).

Therefore, within 28 days Plaintiff shall respond to Defendant's discovery by producing documents or making objections, or perhaps by moving for a protective order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c). Regardless of Plaintiff's course of action, any future discovery-related motion must be proceeded by a good faith attempt to resolve the dispute informally as required by Local Rule 37.1. Plaintiff's motion to strike Defendant's discovery requests is denied.

[Docket No. 522.]

Dated: 05/09/2011

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'T. Baker', is written above a horizontal line.

Tim A. Baker  
United States Magistrate Judge  
Southern District of Indiana

Copies to:

George William Bills Jr.  
LAW OFFICE OF G. WILLIAM BILLS,  
JR.  
gwilliambills@yahoo.com

Jeffrey R. Gaither  
BOSE MCKINNEY & EVANS, LLP  
jgaither@boselaw.com

Kathleen A. Gallagher  
ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN &  
MELLOTT LLC  
kgallagher@eckertseamans.com

Sandy B. Garfinkel  
ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN &  
MELLOTT, LLC  
sgarfinkel@eckertseamans.com

Gregg Heinemann Jr.  
ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN &  
MELLOTT, LLC  
gheinemann@eckertseamans.com

Max W. Hittle Jr.  
KRIEG DEVAULT, LLP  
mhittle@kdlegal.com

Carol Nemeth Joven  
PRICE WAICUKAUSKI & RILEY  
cnemeth@price-law.com

Thomas Livingston  
OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC  
DEFENDER  
thomas\_livingston@fd.org

C. Kent May  
ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN &  
MELLOTT, LLC  
kmay@eckertseamans.com

Craig Morris McKee  
WILKINSON GOELLER MODESITT  
WILKINSON & DRUMMY  
cmmckee@wilkinsonlaw.com

Stephen S. Stallings  
STALLINGS LLC  
sstallings@stallings-law.com

Jana K. Strain  
GEIGER CONRAD & HEAD, LLP  
jana.strain@gch-law.com

Ronald J. Waicukauski  
PRICE WAICUKAUSKI & RILEY  
rwaicukauski@price-law.com

Ann Marie Waldron  
awaldron@rwylaw.com

John H. Williams Jr.  
ECKERT SEAMANS CHERIN &  
MELLOTT, LLC  
jwilliams@eckertseamans.com

SCOTT HALL  
308 Blue Quail Ct.  
Bedford, TX 76021