

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT KNOXVILLE

GREG ADKISSON, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,
Defendant.

No.: 3:13-CV-505-TAV-HBG

Lead Case Consolidated with

KEVIN THOMPSON, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,
Defendant.

No.: 3:13-CV-666-TAV-HBG

as consolidated with

JOE CUNNINGHAM, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,
Defendant.

No.: 3:14-CV-20-TAV-HBG

BILL ROSE,
Plaintiff,
v.
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,
Defendant.

No.: 3:15-CV-17-TAV-HBG

CRAIG WILKINSON, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,
Defendant.

No.: 3:15-CV-274-TAV-HBG

ANGIE SHELTON, as wife and next of
Kin on behalf of Mike Shelton, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,
Defendant.

No.: 3:15-CV-420-TAV-HBG

JOHNNY CHURCH,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No.: 3:15-CV-460-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	
DONALD R. VANGUILDER, JR.,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No.: 3:15-CV-462-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	
JUDY IVENS, as sister and next of kin,)	
on behalf of JEAN NANCE, deceased,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No.: 3:16-CV-635-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	
PAUL RANDY FARROW,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	No.: 3:16-CV-636-TAV-HBG
JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This case is before the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Rules of this Court, and Standing Order 13-02.

Now before the Court is the parties’ Joint Motion for Appointment of Mediator [Doc. 465 in *Adkisson*, 3:13-CV-505; Doc. 448 in *Thompson*, 3:13-CV-666; Doc. 428 in *Cunningham*, 3:14-CV-20; Doc. 360 in *Rose*, 3:15-CV-17; Doc. 368 in *Wilkinson*, 3:15-CV-274; Doc. 349 in *Shelton*, 3:15-CV-420; Doc. 348 in *Church*, 3:15-CV-460; Doc. 352 in *Vanguilder*, 3:15-CV-462; Doc.

236 in *Ivens*, 3:16-CV-635; and Doc. 232 in *Farrow*, 3:16-CV-636], filed on March 14, 2019.¹

Previously, on January 18, 2019, the Court found that this litigation is one that could benefit from mediation, and ordered the parties to mediate the case within one hundred fifty (150) days of the entry of the Order. [Doc. 459 at 5]. The Court subsequently granted an extension of time to file a joint proposal for the selection of a mediator. [Doc. 461].

In the present motion, the parties have submitted a joint proposal and request that the Court approve the appointment of Daniel J. Balhoff to serve as a mediator. [Doc. 465 at 2]. Although Mr. Balhoff is not a member of the Court's List of Approved Mediators, the parties submit that he is an experienced mediator in mass tort litigation, including cases regarding injuries alleged to have been caused by exposure to toxic substances. In support of their motion, the parties have submitted a copy of Mr. Balhoff's curriculum vitae and his statement in accordance with Local Rule 16.

Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Joint Proposal Regarding Selection of Mediator [Doc. 465] is **GRANTED**. In light of the parties' agreement, the Court approves the appointment of Mr. Balhoff to serve as a mediator in the present case. The parties are **DIRECTED** to mediate this litigation in good faith in accordance with the Court's original order referring the case to mediation on January 18, 2019. [Doc. 459].

IT IS SO ORDERED.

ENTER:


United States Magistrate Judge

¹ Unless otherwise indicated, citations to the record refer to the docket entries in *Adkisson*, 3:13-CV-505.