
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION

ELLIS-HALL CONSULTANTS, LLC; a
Utah limited liability company; and
ANTHONY HALL, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GEORGE B. HOFFMAN IV, an individual;
PARSONS KINGHORN HARRIS NKA
COHNE KINGHORN, P.C., a Utah
professional corporation; MATTHEW M.
BOLEY, an individual; KIMBERLY L.
HANSEN, an individual; GARY E.
JUBBER, an individual; and DAVID R.
HAGUE, an individual, FABIAN &
CLENENIN NKA FABIAN VANCOTT,
P.C., a Utah professional corporation,

Defendants.

ORDER AFFIRMING MAGISTRATE
JUDGE PEAD'S RULING AND ORDER
ISSUED ON JULY 30, 2019

Consolidated Case No. 2:12-CV-771

(Consolidated from Case No. 2:15-CV-913)

Judge Dee Benson

In re:

RENEWABLE ENERGY
DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION,

Debtor,

ELIZABETH R. LOVERIDGE, Chapter 7
Trustee,

Plaintiff,

v.

TONY HALL; ELLIS-HALL
CONSULTANTS, LLC; SUMMIT WIND
POWER, LLC, SSP, A Trust (Scott
Rasmussen – Trustee), and DOES I-X,

Defendants.

<p>SUMMIT WIND POWER, LLC</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Counterclaimants,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>GEORGE HOFMANN, Chapter 7 Trustee,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Counterclaim Defendant.</p>	
<p>SUMMIT WIND POWER, LLC, and KIMBERLY CERUTI, an individual,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Third-Party Plaintiffs,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>PARSONS KINGHORN HARRIS, a professional corporation; GEORGE B. HOFMANN; MATTHEW BOLEY; KIMBERLY L. HANSEN; VICTOR P. COPELAND; LISA R. PETERSEN; and MELYSSA DAVIDSON, individuals</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Third-Party Defendants.</p>	

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiffs’ Objections to Magistrate Judge Pead’s July 30, 2019 Ruling & Order (Dkt. No. 463), pursuant to Rule 72(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). (Dkt. No. 475.)¹

Having reviewed Magistrate Judge Pead’s July 30, 2019 Ruling and Order, Plaintiffs’ specific objections thereto, the relevant filings of the parties and the arguments contained therein,

¹ Magistrate Judge Pead’s July 30, 2019 Ruling & Order set forth Judge Pead’s decision on seven (7) separate motions. (Dkt. No. 463.) Although Plaintiffs’ “Objections to the Order & Ruling” (Dkt. No. 475), appear on its face to object to the entirety of the Order & Ruling, it specifically objects to Judge Pead’s ruling on only five of the seven motions: Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel (Dkt. No. 408); Defendants’ Motion for Protective Order (Dkt. No. 419); Defendants’ Motion to Compel (Dkt. No. 409); Plaintiffs’ Motion to Stay or Extend Expert Deadlines (Dkt. No. 449); and Plaintiffs’ Motion for a Protective Order (Dkt. No. 456). (See Dkt. No. 475, Plaintiffs’ Objections.)

as well as having listened to the parties' oral arguments at the July 29, 2019 hearing, the Plaintiffs' objections are OVERRULED. The Court finds no basis for concluding that the Magistrate Judge's Ruling & Order is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Therefore, it is hereby ORDERED:

1. Plaintiffs' Objections are OVERRULED; and
2. Magistrate Judge Pead's July 30, 2019 Ruling and Order is AFFIRMED in its entirety.

DATED this 6th day of September, 2019.

BY THE COURT:



Dee Benson
United States District Judge