

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

TEMUJIN KENSU,

Plaintiff,

Case No: 13-10279

Hon. Victoria A. Roberts

vs

JOSHUA BUSKIRK ET AL,

Defendants.

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST TO FILE A REPLY BRIEF AND
DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER, FINES AND
SANCTIONS**

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for a Protective Order and Petition for Fines and Sanctions. (Doc. # 56). Also, Plaintiff filed a petition for leave to file a reply brief (Doc. 67) and a reply brief (Doc. 66). Plaintiff's substantive motion claims he was harassed by defense counsel, during a deposition. The motion details Plaintiff's version of the events and defense counsel's response provides another version of events.

Regardless, Plaintiff's motion does not make reference to any rule of procedure or any other legal authority as grounds upon which this Court could grant his motion. The motion states facts, but is void of a specific legal theory it wants the Court to consider. At best, the motion requests the Court to "consider the appropriateness of Sanctions against Counselor Farrell for willful ethical violations, violations of discovery and Depositions Rules and relevant Local Rules of the Eastern District Court." (Doc #56, pg. 11)(As it appears in original).

Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(1) provides:

In General. A request for a court order must be made by motion. The motion must:

(B) state with particularity the grounds for seeking the order . . .

Defense counsel provided the Court with a copy of DVD's from the depositions and transcripts, for in camera review. However, since the motion did not set forth the legal standard upon which this Court could grant Plaintiff's motion, a review of the deposition would be meaningless.

Plaintiff's petition for leave is **GRANTED**; the Court accepts Plaintiff's reply brief. Plaintiff's motion for protective order, fines and sanctions is **DENIED**. Plaintiff may re-file his motion, but he must provide the legal standard upon which the Court may grant his motion and the motion must be supported by specific reference to parts of the deposition transcripts where he claims defense counsel harassed him.

IT IS ORDERED.

S/Victoria A. Roberts
Victoria A. Roberts
United States District Judge

Dated: April 23, 2014

The undersigned certifies that a copy of this document was served on the attorneys of record and Temujin Kensu by electronic means or U.S. Mail on April 23, 2014.

s/Linda Vertriest