

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ROGER DORN BALDWIN, <div style="text-align: right;">Plaintiff(s),</div>	}	Case No. 2:17-cv-00807-RFB-NJK
v.	}	ORDER
GEICO GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY, et al., <div style="text-align: right;">Defendant(s).</div>	}	(Docket No. 37)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to compel. Docket No. 37. The "argument" presented consists primarily of a block quotation of Rule 26, brief discussion of an insurer's duty of good faith, and copying-and-pasting the discovery and objections thereto. Docket No. 37 at 6-14. Discovery disputes are not immune from the basic requirement that parties meaningfully develop their arguments. *See, e.g., Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 582 n.3 (D. Nev. 2013). Identifying discovery objections and asserting without elaboration that they "are frivolous and without merit," *see* Docket No. 37 at 12, is woefully insufficient to permit judicial review. Accordingly, the motion to compel is **DENIED** without prejudice. Any renewed motion must present specific, developed argument separately for each disputed discovery request addressing each objection.

IT IS SO ORDERED.
DATED: October 2, 2017



NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge