

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION**

TODD BONDS,
Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:15-cv-641
Litkovitz, M.J.

vs.

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI
MEDICAL CENTER, et al.,
Defendants.

ORDER

This matter is before the Court following a discovery conference between plaintiff and defendants University of Cincinnati Medical Center (UCMC) and Mike Posey held on December 21, 2016.

Pursuant to the record established at the hearing, all litigants and counsel in this case are on notice that they are to treat each other with dignity, courtesy and respect and refrain from any name-calling or threats during the course of this litigation. Any further threats, insults or similar improper conduct by any party will result in sanctions by the Court.

The parties' discovery dispute (*see* Doc. 44-1) is resolved as follows:

1. Interrogatory No. 1: Defendants' objections to the interrogatory as written are **SUSTAINED**. The interrogatory raises multiple points instead of focusing on a single factual issue, and it assumes facts that have not been proven. *See, e.g., Hilt v. SFC Inc.*, 170 F.R.D. 182, 187 (D. Kan. 1997).
2. Interrogatory No. 2: The Court defers ruling on defendants' objections. Within **twenty-one (21) days** of the date of this Order, defendants' counsel shall (1) request a copy of the "Patient Bill of Rights" from UCMC and advise the Court in writing of UCMC's response, and (2) provide to plaintiff a written copy of UCMC's response and any documentation produced by UCMC in response to counsel's request.

3. Interrogatory No. 4: Defendants' objections to the interrogatory as written are **SUSTAINED**. The interrogatory is argumentative and assumes facts that have not been proven. *See Hilt*, 170 F.R.D. at 187.

4. Interrogatory No. 5: Defendants' objections are **SUSTAINED**. The interrogatory is ambiguous and assumes facts that have not been proven. *See Hilt*, 170 F.R.D. at 187.

5. Interrogatories No. 6 and 7: The Court defers ruling on defendants' objections. Within **twenty-one (21) days** of the date of this Order, defendants' counsel shall provide to the Court and to plaintiff sworn verification from UCMC that there is no videotape of the incident giving rise to this lawsuit.

6. Interrogatory No. 8: Defendants' objection is **SUSTAINED**. Plaintiff sought an admission from defendant UCMC through this interrogatory, which defendant UCMC denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date:

12/21/16


Karen L. Litkovitz
United States Magistrate Judge