UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

DR. DOROTHY NAIRNE, et al.   **CIVIL ACTION**

VERSUS   **NO. 22-178-SDD-SDJ**

R. KYLE ARDOIN

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

The Court has reviewed the Motion for Protective Order (R. Doc. 119) filed by Plaintiff,

the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The time for filing a response

has not yet expired.

Substantively, Plaintiff's position appears valid. *See LULAC v. Abbott*, 2022 WL 2806850,

at *7 (W.D. Tex. July 18, 2022) (protecting members' identities). Nonetheless, the Motion for

Protective Order (R. Doc. 119) must still be **DENIED without prejudice** as Plaintiff failed to

sufficiently confer with its opponents in good faith. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1) (must confer in

good faith); *Humphrey v. LeBlanc*, 2022 WL 1179407, at *1 (M.D. La. Apr. 20, 2022) ("[I]t does

not appear that either Party made a good faith effort to resolve the specific issues raised in the

instant Motion . . . . This alone is grounds for denial . . . .").

The Court has already warned both sides of the need to act professionally (R. Doc. 46 at 2-

3) and to make every effort to resolve any discovery disputes without the need for Court

intervention. (R. Doc. 66 at 2); (R. Doc. 74 at 1-2). It has also instructed them to file motions for

status conferences instead of time-consuming discovery motions. (R. Doc. 66 at 2).

For these reasons, the parties are additionally **ORDERED** to **confer** by phone, video, or in person, as soon as possible. But in any event, this conference **must** occur no later than **5:00 p.m. CST** on Monday, **August 21, 2023**.

During this conference, they must work together and make every possible effort to **resolve** the issues raised in the Motion for Protective Order (R. Doc. 119). The Court is confident that these issues can be resolved without its involvement.

Signed in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, on August 17, 2023.

_____

SCOTT D. JOHNSON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE