

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

<hr/>)
WESTERN RESERVE LIFE ASSURANCE)
CO. OF OHIO,)
	Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) C.A. No. 09-470 S
)
CONREAL LLC, HARRISON CONDIT,)
FORTUNE FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC.,)
and ANTHONY PITOCCO,)
	Defendants;)
<hr/>)
TRANSAMERICA LIFE INSURANCE)
COMPANY,)
	Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) C.A. No. 09-471 S
)
JOSEPH CARAMADRE, RAYMOUR)
RADHAKRISHNAN, ESTATE PLANNING)
RESOURCES, INC., ESTELLA PRDRIGUES,)
EDWARD MAGGIACOMO, JR., LIFEMARK)
SECURITIES CORP., and PATRICK GARVEY,)
	Defendants;)
<hr/>)
WESTERN RESERVE LIFE ASSURANCE)
CO. OF OHIO,)
	Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) C.A. No. 09-472 S
)
JOSEPH CARAMADRE, RAYMOUR)
RADHAKRISHNAN, ESTATE PLANNING)
RESOURCES, INC., ADM ASSOCIATES,)
LLC, EDWARD HANRAHAN, THE LEADERS)
GROUP, INC., and CHARLES BUCKMAN,)
	Defendants;)
<hr/>)

WESTERN RESERVE LIFE ASSURANCE)
COMPANY OF OHIO,)
Plaintiff,)

vs.)

JOSEPH CARAMADRE, RAYMOUR)
RADHAKRISHNAN, ESTATE PLANNING)
RESOURCES, INC., DK LLC, EDWARD)
HANRAHAN, THE LEADERS GROUP, INC.,)
and JASON VEVEIROS,)
Defendants;)

C.A. No. 09-473 S

WESTERN RESERVE LIFE ASSURANCE)
COMPANY OF OHIO,)
Plaintiff,)

vs.)

JOSEPH CARAMADRE, RAYMOUR)
RADHAKRISHNAN, ESTATE PLANNING)
RESOURCES, INC., EDWARD HANRAHAN,)
and THE LEADERS GROUP, INC.,)
Defendants;)

C.A. No. 09-502 S

TRANSAMERICA LIFE INSURANCE)
COMPANY,)
Plaintiff,)

vs.)

LIFEMARK SECURITIES CORP.,)
JOSEPH CARAMADRE, RAYMOUR)
RADHAKRISHNAN, ESTATE PLANNING)
RESOURCES, INC., and EDWARD)
MAGGIOCOMO, JR.,)
Defendants;)

C.A. No. 09-549 S

WESTERN RESERVE LIFE ASSURANCE)	
CO. OF OHIO,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	C.A. No. 09-564 S
)	
JOSEPH CARAMADRE, RAYMOUR)	
RADHAKRISHNAN, ESTATE PLANNING)	
RESOURCES, INC., HARRISON CONDIT,)	
and FORTUNE FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC.,)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	

ORDER

Plaintiffs have objected to Magistrate Judge David L. Martin's order dated January 14, 2011 denying Plaintiff's motion for a protective order striking Defendant Estate Planning Resources, Inc.'s interrogatories. They have also sought a stay of the Magistrate Judge's order pending determination of their objection. The Court has reviewed the parties' arguments and finds that the order is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. See 28 U.S.C. § 636; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). The Plaintiffs' objection and motion to stay are therefore DENIED.

ENTER:

/s/ William E. Smith

William E. Smith
United States District Judge
Date: February 16, 2011