

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF  
OKLAHOMA

William Morgan v. Imani Express, LLC, and Muez Gebrehiwot  
Hagdu

Morgan · No. 25-CV-36-JFH-GLJ · Decided December 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma grants in part and denies in part Plaintiff William Morgan’s motion to compel and grants Defendant Imani Express, LLC’s motion to compel in a vehicle-accident action. The order addresses discovery concerning ownership and dispatch records, mechanical failure, driver and personnel records, medical records, financial information, damages computations, non-retained expert disclosures, and claimed injuries. The parties are ordered to supplement discovery and produce documents consistent with the order within 21 days of entry.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Gerald L. Jackson                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| DECIDED               | December 10, 2025                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| DOCKET                | 25-CV-36-JFH-GLJ                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | The court decided Plaintiff's and Defendant Imani Express, LLC's motions to compel discovery in a pending personal-injury action arising from a vehicle accident.                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | Discovery rulings are governed by the relevance and proportionality requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(1), and the trial court has broad discretion to balance the parties' discovery needs and burdens. The timeliness of a motion to compel is evaluated under an eight-factor test identified in Herndon v. City of Henderson. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | Unknown                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| PARTIES               | William Morgan v. Imani Express, LLC, Muez Gebrehiwot Hagdu                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |

TOPICS

discovery dispute

civil procedure

personal injury

punitive damages

affirmative defenses

## PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

personal injury

torts

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff was entitled to compel additional discovery from Hagdu and Imani Express concerning accident history, alleged brake malfunction, affirmative defenses, vehicle ownership, dispatch records, mechanical-failure claims, compensation, employment and driver records, vehicle-condition reports, other accidents, medical records, and financial information.
2. Whether Imani Express's motion to compel was untimely because it was filed after the discovery deadline.
3. Whether Plaintiff was required to supplement his initial disclosures with a computation of damages by category under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1)(A)(iii).
4. Whether Plaintiff's disclosures for seven non-retained treating physicians satisfied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(2)(C).
5. Whether Plaintiff was required to answer an interrogatory concerning permanent scars, disfigurements, disabilities, and discomforts allegedly resulting from the accident.

## HOLDINGS

1. Discovery requests seeking nonprivileged information relevant and proportional to the claims or defenses must be answered or supplemented, and objections must be overruled where the requested information falls within Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(1)'s scope.
2. Imani Express's motion to compel was not untimely under the circumstances, despite being filed after the discovery deadline.
3. A plaintiff must supplement initial disclosures to provide a computation of each category of damages claimed, including amounts for economic and noneconomic damages, consistent with Rule 26(a)(1)(A)(iii).
4. A party identifying non-retained treating physicians as expert witnesses must disclose the subject matter of each physician's expected testimony and a summary of the facts and opinions to which each physician is expected to testify; merely incorporating medical records by reference is insufficient.
5. An interrogatory requiring Plaintiff to identify and describe permanent scars, disfigurements, disabilities, and discomforts allegedly caused by the accident was sufficiently specific and relevant, and Plaintiff was required to answer it.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“The scope of discovery under Rule 26(b)(1) is broad, but it “is not without limits and the trial court is given wide discretion in balancing the needs and rights” of the parties.” (Analysis § I)*

*“Plaintiff ‘cannot satisfy its obligation under Rule 26(a)(2)(C) ‘by merely pointing to large swaths of information,’ like general references to documents.’” (Analysis § III.3)*

*“The parties are to promptly, but in no event less than 21 days of the entry of this Order, supplement discovery and produce documents consistent with this Order.” (Conclusion)*

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The case concerns a vehicle accident between William Morgan and Muez Gebrehiwot Hagdu, who was employed by Imani Express, LLC. The discovery disputes concerned, among other matters, Hagdu's driving and accident history, alleged truck-brake malfunction, ownership and dispatch records, driver qualification and personnel records, medical records, financial information relevant to punitive damages, Plaintiff's damages computation, treating-physician disclosures, and claimed injuries.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action arose from a vehicle accident involving Plaintiff and Defendant Hagdu while Hagdu was employed by Imani Express. The case was referred to the magistrate judge on May 30, 2025, for further proceedings under 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72. After a December 10, 2025 hearing, the court granted Plaintiff's motion to compel in part and denied it in part, and granted Imani's motion to compel.

## DISPOSITION

other

## CASES CITED

- Gomez v. Martin Marietta Corp., 50 F.3d 1511, 1520 (10th Cir.)
- LoganTree LP v. Garmin International, Inc., 339 F.R.D. 171 (D. Kan. 2021)
- Hofer v. Mack Trucks, Inc., 981 F.2d 377, 380 (8th Cir.)
- Johnson v. Kraft Foods N. Am., Inc., 238 F.R.D. 648, 653 (D. Kan.)
- Herndon v. City of Henderson, 507 F. Supp. 3d 1243, 1247-48 (D. Nev. 2020)
- Lucas v. Transamerica Life Ins. Co., 2011 WL 5148883, at \*2 (E.D. Ky. Oct. 21, 2011)
- Richardson v. Rock City Mechanical Co., 2010 WL 711830 (M.D. Tenn. Nov. 2, 2010)
- McKinney v. Reassure Am. Life Ins. Co., 2005 WL 3228791, at \*1-\*2 (E.D. Okla. Nov. 2, 2006)
- Sender v. Mann, 225 F.R.D. 645, 650 (D. Colo.)
- City and County of San Francisco v. Tutor-Saliba Corp., 218 F.R.D. 219, 221 (N.D. Cal.)
- Roof Rehab, LLC v. Travelers Casualty Ins. Co. of America, 2021 WL 5579053, at \* (D. Colo. Nov. 30, 2021)
- Green Earth Wellness Ctr. LLC v. Atain Specialty Ins. Co., 2016 WL 632051, at \*3 (D. Colo. Feb. 17, 2016)
- Nosewicz v. Janosko, 2019 WL 4248895, at \*6 (D. Colo. Aug. 19, 2019)
- Nosewicz v. Janosko, 2019 WL 4242739 (D. Colo. Sept. 6, 2019)

---

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-okl/2025/william-morgan-v-imani-express-llc-and-muez-gebrehiwot-hagdu-7448yyt4>