

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

-----x  
:  
MICHAEL JOSEPH :  
:  
: CIV. NO. 3:14CV00424 (AWT)  
v. :  
:  
:  
SIKORSKY AIRCRAFT : July 6, 2015  
PRATT & WHITNEY :  
:  
:-----x

**RULING AND ORDER**

This ruling and order memorializes the Court's rulings made during a case management/discovery conference held on July 2, 2015, and sets a schedule for the exchange of information.

Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time **[Doc. #59]** is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part. All discovery must be completed by **August 17, 2015**. Dispositive Motions, if any, shall be filed on or before **October 15, 2015**. The parties will contact the Court as soon as possible if any issues arise that may delay the progress of this case, before these deadlines expire. **The Court does not anticipate granting any further extensions of these deadlines.**

Plaintiff's Motion to Compel **[Doc. #60]** is **DENIED** in light of the parties' reported agreement as to the bulk of the issues raised therein and as discussed on the record at the hearing. The parties' Proposed Joint Scheduling Order **[Doc. #66]** is so ordered **in part**, as set forth herein.

The depositions of Andrew Gagnon, Steven Paluba and Michael Sabatella are scheduled for **August 6, 2015**. The depositions of Christine Cassina, Donald Rogers and John Vanleeuwen are scheduled for **August 13, 2015**. The parties have indicated that these dates are mutually agreeable. The plaintiff's examination of each of these witnesses shall be limited to no more than two hours, as discussed at the hearing.

Plaintiff's request to depose Megha Parikh and Susan Kahil is **DENIED** for the reasons stated on the record at the hearing.

Interrogatory No. 13(b) to Sikorsky: Plaintiff will provide written clarification of the information he is seeking in this request by **July 9, 2015**. Defendant will respond to the request by **July 23, 2015**. If there are no responsive documents, defendant will provide a written response to that effect pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(g).

Interrogatory No. 12 to Pratt & Whitney: Defendant will produce any non-privileged documents pertaining to any investigation of plaintiff's letter dated March 15, 2012, which plaintiff claims was transmitted pursuant to defendants' Ombudsman/DIALOG Program, on or before **July 30, 2015**. If there are no responsive documents, defendant will provide a written response to that effect pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(g).

Plaintiff's Letter to the Attorney General: Plaintiff will produce a copy of a letter he sent to the Attorney General by

**July 23, 2015.** If plaintiff is unable to locate a copy of the letter, he will provide an affidavit stating what efforts he made to locate the document by **July 23, 2015.**

Pursuant to Rule 26(e)(1)(A) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, parties must supplement their initial disclosures as well as responses to interrogatories and requests for production of documents "in a timely manner if the party learns that in some material respect the disclosure or response is incomplete or incorrect." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e)(1)(A). The parties are instructed to adhere to the duty set forth in Rule 26(e)(1)(A) "with special promptness as the trial date approaches" without the Court's further intervention. 6 JAMES WM. MOORE, MOORE'S FEDERAL PRACTICE §26.131[3] (3d ed. 2014).

This is not a recommended ruling. This is a discovery ruling and order which is reviewable pursuant to the "clearly erroneous" statutory standard of review. See 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), 6(e) and 72(a); Rule 2 of the Local Rules for United States Magistrate Judges. As such, it is an order of the Court unless reversed or modified by the district judge upon motion timely made.

SO ORDERED at New Haven, Connecticut, this 6th day of July 2015.

/s/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
HON. SARAH A. L. MERRIAM  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE