UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

KURIAN DAVID, et al. Plaintiffs	CIVIL ACTION
VERSUS	No. 08-1220
SIGNAL INTERNATIONAL, LLC, et al., Defendants	SECTION "E"
Related Cases:	
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION, Plaintiff	CIVIL ACTION
VERSUS	No. 12-557
SIGNAL INTERNATIONAL, LLC, et al., Defendants	SECTION "E"
LAKSHMANAN PONNAYAN ACHARI, et al., Plaintiffs	CIVIL ACTION
VERSUS	No. 13-6218 (c/w 13-6219, 13-6220, 13-6221)
SIGNAL INTERNATIONAL, LLC, et al., Defendants	SECTION "E"

Applies To: *David v. Signal* (08-1220)

ORDER AND REASONS

Before the Court is Signal International, LLC's ("Signal") Motion for Partial

Summary Judgment.¹ Plaintiffs oppose Signal's motion.²

Signal seeks partial summary judgment "recognizing [its] constitutionally protected right to pursue, at trial, its defense of innocence by questioning those who accuse it of criminal and other wrongdoing about motive."³ Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(a), "[a] party may move for summary judgment, identifying each claim or defense - or the part of each claim or defense - on which summary judgment is sought." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a).

The relief Signal seeks is not the proper object of a summary judgment motion. A judgment recognizing Signal's right to question the plaintiffs about motive would not resolve a "claim or defense" as contemplated by Rule 56. Although Signal asserts its motion seeks a protection of its right to prove a defense of "innocence," Signal's motion does not seek a judgment dismissing Plaintiffs' claims and recognizing its actual innocence. Signal merely requests its *right* to pursue a defense of innocence be recognized through summary judgment. The Court finds Signal's use of a Rule 56 motion improper.

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that Signal's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment be and hereby is **DENIED**.

New Orleans, Louisiana, this $\underline{12th}$ day of February, 2014.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹R. Doc. 1466.

²R. Doc. 1505.

³R. Doc. 1466, p. 1.