

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CAROLYN WRIGHT,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CAM HILTZ TRUCKING, et al.,

Defendants.

---

CASE NO. 13-CV-14690

HON. MARK A. GOLDSMITH

**ORDER STRIKING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL (Dkt. 19)**

On July 23, 2014, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel (Dkt. 19). The Case Management and Scheduling Order requires that counsel seek concurrence from opposing counsel prior to filing any motion. Specifically, section II.B.1 of the Order provides that, "The Court requires strict compliance with E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(a), which obligates moving parties to seek concurrence before filing any motion. A moving party must certify compliance with this obligation by setting forth in the first paragraph of every motion" one of four statements, or a substantially similar one, as outlined in the Order. See 1/17/14 Order (Dkt. 8). The Order further requires certification of compliance with the obligation to seek concurrence, and it warns that failure to satisfy these requirements "will result in the motion being struck." Id. (emphasis deleted). Plaintiff's motion does not satisfy these requirements or provide good cause for excusing them.

Accordingly, the Court strikes the motion to compel (Dkt. 19).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 24, 2014  
Flint, Michigan

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

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record and any unrepresented parties via the Court's ECF System to their respective email or First Class U.S. mail addresses disclosed on the Notice of Electronic Filing on July 24, 2014.

s/Deborah J. Goltz  
DEBORAH J. GOLTZ  
Case Manager