

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

BAYOU INDUSTRIAL SALES, L.L.C.

CIVIL ACTION

VERSUS

NO. 15-283-BAJ-RLB

PETRO-VALVE, INC.

ORDER

Before the Court is Petro-Valve, Inc.'s Motion for Expedited Ruling (R. Doc. 37) filed on April 28, 2017. Petro-Valve seeks expedited consideration of its Motion to Compel (R. Doc. 35) filed on April 27, 2017, which seeks an order requiring supplemental responses to requests for production served on Bayou Industrial Sales, L.L.C. ("Bayou") on February 1, 2016 (R. Doc. 35-7), and Keith Foote and David Foote on June 7, 2016 (R. Doc. 35-2; R. Doc. 35-3). Petro-Valve represents that Bayou provided initial objections and responses on July 21, 2016, and supplemental responses on April 21, 2017. (R. Doc. 25 at 3). Petro-Valve further represents that Keith Foote and David Foote provided their initial responses and objections on April 20, 2017. (R. Doc. 35 at 2).

On January 6, 2017, the Court extended certain deadlines in its Scheduling Order. (R. Doc. 24). Among other things, the Court set the deadline for Plaintiffs and Counterclaimants to provide expert reports on April 28, 2017; the deadline for Defendants and Counterclaim-Defendants to provide expert reports on May 30, 2017; and the deadline to complete all discovery on June 30, 2017. (R. Doc. 34).

On April 28, 2017, in addition to the instant motion, Petro-Valve filed a motion for extension of its April 28, 2017 deadline to provide expert reports in its capacity as a Third Party

Plaintiff and Counterclaimant. (R. Doc. 36). In support of that motion, Petro-Valve asserts that until the Court rules upon the motion to compel, and it obtains the discovery sought, it “does not have sufficient information to provide to its expert so that he may render an opinion” on Petro-Valve’s counterclaims and third party claims. (R. Doc. 36 at 2).

Petro-Valve now seeks expedited consideration on its motion to compel in light of the remaining discovery deadlines in the Court’s amended Scheduling Order. (R. Doc. 37-1 at 2). While it is unclear to the Court why Petro-Valve waited until the eve of its deadline to provide expert reports to file a motion to compel production of discovery, the Court finds it appropriate to consider the motion to compel on an expedited basis, once the motion is fully briefed, to avoid any additional interference with the remaining deadlines in this action.

The Court does not, however, find good cause pursuant to Local Rule 7(f) to require responses to Petro-Valve’s motion to compel to be filed on an expedited basis.

Based on the foregoing,

IT IS ORDERED that Petro-Valve’s Motion for Expedited Ruling (R. Doc. 37) is **GRANTED in part and DENIED in part**. The Court will consider Petro-Valve’s Motion to Compel (R. Doc. 35) on an expedited basis once the motion is fully briefed. Any opposition to Petro-Valve’s Motion to Compel must be filed “within twenty-one days after service of the motion” as provided by Local Rule 7(f).

Signed in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, on May 5, 2017.



RICHARD L. BOURGEOIS, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE