

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

JUSTIN GUY,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 20-12734

Hon. Mark A. Goldsmith

vs.

ABSOPURE WATER COMPANY,

Defendant.

**OPINION & ORDER**

**(1) GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STAY  
DISCOVERY (Dkt. 49) AND (2) AMENDING THE SCHEDULING ORDER (Dkt. 23)**

Plaintiff Justin Guy has filed a motion to stay discovery (Dkt. 49). Guy requests a stay or, alternatively, a three-month extension of the discovery deadline and all other deadlines. Guy argues that a stay or extension is necessary to allow sufficient time for the discovery dispute resolution process with the special discovery master, who was appointed to help the parties resolve their outstanding discovery disputes. The parties discussed Guy's motion with the special discovery master, and the special discovery master then wrote an interim report setting forth her views on the issues raised by the motion. See Interim Report (Dkt. 51).

Following the special discovery master's interim report, the Court conferred with the special discovery master to better understand the parties' positions. The Court then issued an order informing the parties that it believed that an extension of discovery until March 1, 2022 and an extension of the dispositive motion deadline to March 29, 2022 would be appropriate. 12/8/21 Order (Dkt. 52). The Court gave the parties an opportunity to file memoranda regarding their views on the Court's proposal. Id. at 1–2. Guy filed a memorandum (Dkt. 53), asking the Court to enter a stay until the Court resolves Guy's forthcoming motion to compel.

Due to the parties' demonstrated difficulty in judiciously resolving their discovery disputes, deadlines are necessary to properly incentivize the parties to timely complete discovery. Thus, a stay would be inappropriate. However, the Court will extend the discovery and dispositive motion deadlines by two and a half months, which will give the parties sufficient time to work with the special discovery master to resolve their outstanding discovery disputes. Accordingly, Guy's motion (Dkt. 49) is granted in part and denied in part, and the deadlines contained in the scheduling order (Dkt. 23) are amended as follows:

<u>EVENT</u>	<u>DEADLINE</u>
Discovery as to conditional certification issues and as to the individual Plaintiff's claims as it stands at the present time	<b>March 1, 2022</b>
Discovery as to MCA exemption	<b>March 1, 2022</b>
Motions for Summary Judgment on the Motor Carrier Act (MCA) exemption	<b>March 29, 2022</b>
Plaintiff's Motion to Conditionally Certify Collective Action	<b>March 29, 2022</b>
Joint Status Report	<b>10 days after ruling on motions for summary judgment and motion to conditionally certify class action</b>
All Other Motions, Including Motions in Limine	<b>TBD</b>
Final Settlement Conference	<b>TBD</b>
Joint Final Pretrial Order	<b>TBD</b>
Final Pretrial Conference	<b>TBD</b>
Trial - Jury	<b>TBD</b>

SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 20, 2021  
Detroit, Michigan

s/Mark A. Goldsmith  
MARK A. GOLDSMITH  
United States District Judge