## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

CA 09-470 S

WESTERN RESERVE LIFE ASSURANCE CO. OF OHIO,

Plaintiff, :

: v.

CONREAL LLC, HARRISON CONDIT, : FORTUNE FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC.,:

and ANTHONY PITOCCO,

Defendants. :

TRANSAMERICA LIFE INSURANCE

COMPANY,

Plaintiff, :

v. : CA 09-471 S

JOSEPH CARAMADRE, RAYMOUR
RADHAKRISHNAN, ESTATE PLANNING
RESOURCES, INC., ESTELLA
RODRIGEUS, EDWARD MAGGIACOMO,
JR., LIFEMARK SECURITIES CORP.,

and PATRICK GARVEY,

Defendants. :

WESTERN RESERVE LIFE ASSURANCE

CO. OF OHIO,

Plaintiff,

v. : CA 09-472 S

JOSEPH CARAMADRE, RAYMOUR : RADHAKRISHNAN, ESTATE PLANNING : RESOURCES, INC., ADM ASSOCIATES, : LLC, EDWARD HANRAHAN, THE LEADERS: GROUP, INC., and CHARLES BUCKMAN,:

Defendants. :

WESTERN RESERVE LIFE ASSURANCE : COMPANY OF OHIO, Plaintiff, V. CA 09-473 S JOSEPH CARAMADRE, RAYMOUR RADHAKRISHNAN, ESTATE PLANNING RESOURCES, INC., DK LLC, EDWARD HANRAHAN, THE LEADERS GROUP, INC., and JASON VEVEIROS, Defendants. : WESTERN RESERVE LIFE ASSURANCE : COMPANY OF OHIO, Plaintiff, CA 09-502 S v. JOSEPH CARAMADRE, RAYMOUR RADHAKRISHNAN, ESTATE PLANNING RESOURCES, INC., NATCO PRODUCTS, : EDWARD HANRAHAN, and THE LEADERS : GROUP, INC., Defendants. : TRANSAMERICA LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, Plaintiff, : CA 09-549 S V. LIFEMARK SECURITIES CORP., JOSEPH CARAMADRE, RAYMOUR RADHAKRISHNAN, ESTATE PLANNING

RESOURCES, INC., and EDWARD

MAGGIACOMO,

Defendants. :

#### ORDER

# GRANTING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR ENTRY OF A CONFIDENTIALITY ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Motion for Entry of a Confidentiality Order (Docket ("Dkt.") #70) ("Motion"). An objection to the Motion has been filed by Defendants Estate Planning Resources, Inc., ADM Associates, LLC, Joseph Caramadre, Raymour Radhakrishnan, Harrison Condit, and Estela Rodrigues.

See Objection of Defendants Estate Planning Resources, Inc., ADM Associates, LLC, Joseph Caramadre, Raymour Radhakrishnan, Harrison Condit, and Estela Rodrigues to Plaintiffs' Motion for Entry of a Confidentiality Order (Dkt. #75) ("Objection"). A hearing was held on January 7, 2011.

The Motion is GRANTED. The Court is unpersuaded that the concern expressed by the Defendants who filed the Objection (the "Objecting Defendants"), namely that a producing party may unreasonably withhold consent to a request from the Objecting Defendants to use a produced document in another proceeding, warrants at this point shifting the burden of seeking judicial relief to the producing party. However, the Objecting Defendants may seek a reconsideration of this ruling if there are two separate instances where a producing party refuses to consent to a produced document being used in another proceeding and the Court determines that the Objecting Defendants should be allowed to use the document in the other proceeding.

### ENTER:

### /s/ David L. Martin

DAVID L. MARTIN
United States Magistrate Judge
January 10, 2011