

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRETheresa D'Jamoos, et al

v.


Civil No. 08-cv-108-SM

Atlas Aircraft Center, Inc., et alRe: Document No. 98, 115, 116, Motion(s) to Compel

Ruling: The plaintiffs' motions to compel and supplemental motion to compel (Docs. no. 98, 115, and 116) are denied, without prejudice. The record is not developed sufficiently to permit a ruling on the individual discovery requests that may be in contention. It seems that requests were made and objected to, but responsive information in some form and to some degree was produced, or was agreed to be produced, while other information or documents were not, on grounds of relevancy or burden. And, it appears that significant production occurred after the motion to compel was filed (though counsel seemingly was aware of the imminent production). And, plaintiffs say they are willing to enter into good faith discussions with Pilatus in an effort to reduce the number of electrical components and modifications to those components that are the subject of their requests, which apparently has not taken place. And, the motions to compel are not

in the form required by Local Rule 37.1. The papers simply do not disclose with the requisite degree of specificity what is being sought, what has been produced responsive to specific requests, and what remains that is still sought but objected to, nor do they reveal, with specificity, what objections pertain to specific requests still outstanding. Perhaps some of the partial disclosures were adequate, perhaps not. Perhaps some of the requests defendant agreed to meet are now resolved, perhaps not. Plaintiffs may refile, assuming a specific dispute remains with respect to specific production requests, and good faith negotiations have proven futile. The court expects counsel to cooperate and conduct discovery with the minimum necessary court intervention - if court intervention becomes necessary, the dispute(s) must be described in specific detail, the objections presented with a high degree of specificity, and each dispute separately and fully briefed.

So ordered.



Chief Judge Steven J. McAuliffe

Date: December 7, 2010

cc: Counsel of Record