

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
WESTERN DIVISION**

Michael McReynolds	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 4:16-01055-CV-W-HFS
	)	
Officer Darrell Schmidli, et. al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

**MEMORANDUM TO COUNSEL**

By letter dated April 18, submitted on behalf of both sides, informal assistance is sought regarding pending interrogatories addressed to plaintiff. Judicial assistance is very rarely sought on such questions and my familiarity with common discovery practice is rusty, to say the least. My supposition is that interrogatories in the first case should be treated as having been filed in the second identical case. I would, however, tend to be liberal in allowing more interrogatories than authorized by the local rules, if reasonably needed for preparation.

The specific objections to interrogatories seem directed to defendants' request which is essentially for the plaintiff to lay out his whole case, as he can pull it together in advance of discovery. This is arguably unduly burdensome, since the case will develop during discovery -- but it seems rather like the requirements of Rule 26, applicable to both sides. Different district judges probably have different reactions. If counsel cannot work this out I request some citations regarding current practice, focused on this subject. In general, I favor both sides laying their cards on the table, but this should not be pursued tediously since the case is supposedly still in an embryonic status.

/s/ Howard F. Sachs  
HOWARD F. SACHS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

April 23, 2018  
Kansas City, Missouri