UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

CONSTANCE E. BAGLEY, Plaintiff, v. YALE UNIVERSITY, DOUGLAS RAE, EDWARD SNYDER, and ANDREW METRICK, Individually, Defendants.	Civil Action No. 3:13-cv-1890 (CSH) **FEBRUARY 23, 2015**

SCHEDULING ORDER ON DISCOVERY MOTIONS

HAIGHT, Senior District Judge:

There has been a spate of recent motions related to discovery in this case.

On February 19, 2015, Defendants filed a Motion for a Protective Order, [Doc. 108]. On February 20, 2015, Defendants filed two more Motions for Protective Orders, [Doc. 109] and [Doc. 110]. In Doc. 108, Defendants seek relief from an obligation to continue a Plaintiff-demanded review of electronically stored information. In Doc. 109, Defendants seek to limit the Plaintiff-noticed deposition of Yale University President Peter Salovey from seven hours to two hours. In Doc. 110, Defendants seek to limit Plaintiff to ten depositions.

On February 20, 2015, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Strike [Doc. 111] these three motions by Defendants, "due to Defendants' failure to confer with Plaintiff's counsel in good faith on these issues before seeking Court intervention." Doc. 111, at 1. Plaintiff's motion adds: "In fact, counsel for the parties have a telephone conference scheduled for tomorrow, Saturday, February 21, 2015, to discuss

these and other discovery disputes that have arisen over the last two weeks." *Id*. In those circumstances, Plaintiff's counsel concludes with asperity, Defendants' filing of their Motions for Protective Orders "in advance of the scheduled telephone conference" serve to "reflect the Defendants' inflexibility and attempts throughout this litigation to undermine the rules and spirit of discovery." Doc. 111, at 2.

I will risk a charge of judicial *naiveté* and indulge the thought that the February 21 telephone conference among counsel, taking place the day after this exchange of broadsides and as their thunder receded with the setting sun, resolved all these issues to the satisfaction of both sides, so that these motions may be withdrawn. But if the motions remain for Court decision, in part if not in their entirety, then the Court concludes that an expedited briefing schedule should be adopted to keep the case moving with desirable despatch. In consequence, the Court makes the following Scheduling Order:

1. Plaintiff's Motion to Strike [Doc. 111] Defendants' Motions for Protective Orders [Docs. 108, 109 and 110] was not accompanied by a memorandum of law. *See* D. Conn. L. Civ. R. 7(a)(1) ("[a]ny motion involving disputed issues of law shall be accompanied by a written memorandum of law"). The Court declines to consider that procedural motion on its merits. Plaintiff may include her procedural objection to Defendants' motions when she files and serves papers in opposition to Defendants' motions. Plaintiff must file and serve those opposition papers on or before **March 2, 2015.** The Court will regard Plaintiff's substantive opposition to Defendants' motions as alternative contentions to the procedural objection Plaintiff makes in her motion to strike, Doc. 111. If the Court grants Plaintiff's motion to strike Defendants' motions, the Court will not consider the merits of Defendants' motions.

2. Defendants may file opposing papers with respect to Plaintiff's motion, Doc. 111, and reply papers in support of Defendants' motions, Docs. 108, 109 and 110, on or before **March 9, 2015.**

3. Plaintiff may file reply papers in support of her motion to strike, Doc. 111, on or before **March 13, 2015.**

If the Court desires oral argument on these motions, counsel will be advised by Chambers.

It is SO ORDERED.

Dated: New Haven, Connecticut
February 23, 2015

/s/Charles S. Haight, Jr.
CHARLES S. HAIGHT, JR.
Senior United States District Judge