

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON

JOSEPH M. RIEGER,

Plaintiff,

Case No.: 3:13-cv-402

vs.

GENERAL DYNAMICS INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY, INC.,

Judge Walter H. Rice
Magistrate Judge Michael J. Newman

Defendant.

ORDER

On March 7, 2014, the Court held an informal discovery conference by telephone to address multiple discovery issues raised by both sides. The Court resolved numerous concerns informally. Several matters require further discussion herein.

First, Defendant raised concerns that Plaintiff served discovery requests related to a claim for retaliation. As has been addressed previously, Plaintiff's only claim pending before the Court is for age discrimination. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff may not seek discovery related to a potential claim for retaliation.

Plaintiff served Defendant with 186 requests for admission, to which Defendant raised several objections. The Court **STRIKES** Plaintiff's requests for admission. The parties are directed to review Local Rule 36.1, which provides that "no party shall serve more than forty (40) requests for admission (including all subparts) upon any other party." Accordingly, Plaintiff may serve Defendant with no more than 40 requests for admission.

Plaintiff raised several concerns regarding the use of his personal information provided through discovery. The Court advised Plaintiff that such information will remain confidential and may not be publicly disclosed by Defendant or otherwise used in a manner outside the scope of this litigation.

Both sides discussed their desire to enter into a Protective Order. Defendant advised the Court that it anticipated sending a draft Protective Order for Plaintiff to review within ten days. Plaintiff is directed to expeditiously review the proposal. The Court directs that the proposed Protective Order cover Plaintiff's personal information, including, but not limited to, his Social Security number. The parties shall submit a joint proposed Protective Order for the Court's review in a Word document by email to newman_chambers@ohsd.uscourts.gov. If the parties are unable to reach an agreement, each party shall submit its respective proposed version. As the parties made clear, that they have already begun discovery while discussing the entry of a Protective Order; it will cover all discovery in this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

March 10, 2014

s/ **Michael J. Newman**
United States Magistrate Judge