

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
AT KNOXVILLE

ANGELA BLANCE,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 3:12-CV-579-PLR-HBG
	)	
ARC AUTOMOTIVE, INC.,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

The parties appeared before the undersigned on June 4, 2014, for a telephonic discovery-dispute conference pursuant to Section 4(j) of the Scheduling Order [Doc. 9]. Attorney Ursula Bailey was present representing the Plaintiff, and Attorney Ed Trent was present representing the Defendant.

The Plaintiff served her First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents on the Defendant, and the Defendant responded to the Interrogatories and Requests for Production in a timely manner. The Defendant declined to answer Interrogatory No. 4 through Interrogatory No. 19, because the Defendant believed that the Interrogatory No. 1, Interrogatory No. 2, and Interrogatory No. 3, with subparts, met the limit of 25 interrogatories contained in Rule 33. Thus, the issue before the undersigned was whether Plaintiff had served “more than 25 written interrogatories, including all discrete subparts.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1).

The Court heard the parties' positions on this issue, and reviewed each of the interrogatories propounded by the Plaintiff with the parties. After discussing the issues with the Court, the parties agreed that:

1. The Defendant will supplement its response to Interrogatory No. 3;
2. The Defendant will supplement its response to Interrogatory No. 14;
3. The Defendant will provide Plaintiff with any information it has regarding the whereabouts of Carol Davis; and
4. The Defendant will answer Interrogatory No. 16 to the best of its ability.

The parties agreed that with these supplements, all issues before the Court were fully resolved.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

ENTER:

  
United States Magistrate Judge