

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF  
MASSACHUSETTS

**Aimee L. Kingston v. Gregory Strange, Frank Caridi, Stephanie  
Danielson, Kevin Greiner, Connor Read, Dottie Fulginiti, Peter  
Deschenes, Robert Stetson, Christopher Anderson, Christopher  
Anderson, and Amos Keddem**

Kingston · No. No. 24-cv-12021-DJC · Decided November 26, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts denies Defendants’ motion to quash Plaintiff’s second set of requests for admissions. The court holds that the seven distinct requests should not be multiplied by the number of defendants for purposes of Local Rule 26.1(c)’s discovery limits, and alternatively grants permission to serve the requests. The court also addresses and denies or declines to consider various sanctions and other requests included in Plaintiff’s lengthy opposition memorandum.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Paul G. Levenson                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| DECIDED               | November 26, 2025                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| DOCKET                | No. 24-cv-12021-DJC                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Plaintiff asserted constitutional claims arising from a 2022 stop-work order. After dismissal of various claims and defendants, Plaintiff served a second set of requests for admissions on the remaining individual defendants. Defendants moved to quash those requests under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) and Local Rule 26.1(c). |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | A motion to challenge discovery may be brought under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c), which permits a protective order for good cause to prevent annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, undue burden, or undue expense. Objections to a magistrate judge's                                                                               |

|                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                           | nondispositive order are reviewed under the clearly erroneous or contrary-to-law standard under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a).                                                                          |
| <b>PRECEDENTIAL VALUE</b> | unpublished_nonprecedential                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| <b>PARTIES</b>            | Aimee L. Kingston v. Gregory Strange, Frank Caridi, Stephanie Danielson, Kevin Greiner, Connor Read, Dottie Fulginiti, Peter Deschenes, Robert Stetson, Christopher Anderson, Christopher Anderson, Amos Keddem |

## TOPICS

discovery dispute civil procedure sanctions procedural due process section 1983

## PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure civil rights constitutional law discovery

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Local Rule 26.1(c)'s twenty-five-request limit requires each request for admission to be counted separately for every defendant to whom it is served.
2. Whether Defendants were entitled to a protective order or order quashing Plaintiff's second set of requests for admissions under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).
3. Whether Plaintiff was entitled to sanctions under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 based on Defendants' interpretation of the local discovery limit.
4. Whether Plaintiff could obtain unrelated discovery relief and other remedies through her opposition to the motion to quash.

## HOLDINGS

1. Each distinct request for admission served on multiple opposing defendants is counted as a single request for purposes of Local Rule 26.1(c), rather than being counted separately for each defendant.
2. Defendants' motion to quash Plaintiff's second set of requests for admissions was denied.
3. Plaintiff's request for sanctions under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11(c)(1) was denied.
4. Requests for relief unrelated to the motion to quash were denied without prejudice, and Plaintiff's forty-three-page opposition violated Local Rule 7.1(b)(4)'s twenty-page limit absent leave of court.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*"As a matter of common sense, however, Defendants' method of re-counting the same RFA for every party is unworkable."* (Section III)

*"For the forgoing reasons, Defendants' Motion to Quash Plaintiff's Second Set of Requests for Admissions (Docket No. 74) is DENIED."* (Conclusion)

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The underlying action concerns Plaintiff's renovation of a historic property in Easton, Massachusetts, and a town building inspector's 2022 stop-work order. Plaintiff alleges that the order and its aftermath violated her constitutional rights. After prior dismissals, eleven individual municipal officials remained defendants on a procedural due process claim, and Plaintiff served them with seven requests for admissions.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was filed in the District of Massachusetts, and the court previously dismissed various claims and defendants, leaving only a procedural due process claim against the individual defendants. Plaintiff served seven requests for admissions directed to the defendants. Defendants argued that each request should be counted separately for each of the eleven defendants, thereby producing seventy-seven requests and exceeding the local limit of twenty-five. The magistrate judge denied the motion to quash and denied related requests for sanctions and other relief.

## DISPOSITION

other

## CASES CITED

- *Phinney v. Wentworth Douglas Hosp.*, 199 F.3d 1, 4 (1st Cir. 1999)
- *Sunview Condo. Ass'n v. Flexel Int'l, Ltd.*, 116 F.3d 962, 964–65 (1st Cir. 1997)