

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION

BELINDA F. KERUSCH,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	17-cv-2059-SHM-tmp
)	
FORDHARRISON LLP,)	
)	
and)	
)	
LOUIS P. BRITT, III, in his)	
capacity as Office Managing)	
Partner of FordHarrison LLP-)	
Memphis,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S SECOND MOTION TO COMPEL

Before the court is *pro se* plaintiff Belinda F. Kerusch's Second Motion to Compel, filed on July 20, 2018.¹ (ECF No. 39.) Defendants FordHarrison LLP and Luis P. Britt, III (collectively "FordHarrison") responded on July 24, 2018. (ECF No. 40.)

On July 10, 2018, FordHarrison responded to Kerusch's first set of interrogatories and request for documents. (ECF No. 40 at 1.) Kerusch found these documents lacking and requested additional information. Accordingly, on July 18, 2018, FordHarrison provided

¹This case has been referred to the United States magistrate judge for management and for all pretrial matters for determination and/or report and recommendation as appropriate. (ECF No. 23.)

Kerusch with an additional 1,600 pages of discovery. (ECF No. 39 at 3; ECF No. 40 at 2.) Kerusch argues that this discovery is incomplete and inaccurate; although, she does not provide discrete examples of how it is insufficient. She asks that the court sanction FordHarrison and compel it to provide sufficient discovery. She also states that, after reviewing the discovery, she decided that she needed to take at least eight additional depositions. Thus, she also asks that the court extend the discovery deadline.

FordHarrison states that it has attempted on multiple occasions to consult with Kerusch in order to review her concerns about the discovery that it provided to her. (ECF No. 40 at 2-3.)

Also, it has scheduled the nine depositions Kerusch requested to occur before the discovery deadline. (ECF No. 40 at 5.)

In light of the ongoing consultation process, the court finds that Kerusch's motion is premature. In addition, because her motion does not explain how the provided discovery is lacking, the court cannot determine whether there is any validity to her claims.

Finally, she has not shown that she needs the discovery deadline extended. For these reasons, her motion to compel, for sanctions, and to extend the discovery deadline is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Tu M. Pham

TU M. PHAM
United States Magistrate Judge

August 8, 2018
Date
