

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
LOUISIANA

Jansen Combs v. Formosa Plastics Corporation, Louisiana

Combs · No. No. 25-388-BAJ-RLB · Decided February 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana grants in part and denies in part Formosa Plastics Corporation, Louisiana’s unopposed motion to compel discovery from Jansen Combs. The court compels supplemental responses to specified interrogatories and requests for production, requires execution of authorization forms, extends the non-expert discovery deadline, and awards reasonable attorney’s fees and costs, while declining to compel further responses to certain interrogatories on the record presented.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Richard L. Bourgeois, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Louisiana
DECIDED	February 18, 2026
DOCKET	No. 25-388-BAJ-RLB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved to compel discovery responses, to recover reasonable attorney's fees and costs, and to extend the non-expert discovery deadline. The motion was unopposed.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure governing discovery motions and considered whether Plaintiff failed to respond timely to interrogatories and requests for production. The moving party bears the burden of showing that requested information is relevant or likely to lead to admissible evidence; once that showing is made, the resisting party must substantiate its objections.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; generally persuasive rather than precedential.
PARTIES	Jansen Combs v. Formosa Plastics Corporation, Louisiana

TOPICS

discovery dispute

civil procedure

employment discrimination

title vii

racial discrimination

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

employment law

employment discrimination

civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff should be compelled to provide responses to the unanswered interrogatories and requests for production.
2. Whether Plaintiff waived objections to discovery requests by failing to serve timely responses or objections.
3. Whether Plaintiff could be compelled to complete and sign authorization forms requested under Rule 34.
4. Whether the non-expert discovery deadline should be extended.
5. Whether Defendant was entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing the motion to compel.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff must provide complete supplemental responses to Interrogatory Nos. 7-12 and 16-22 and Requests for Production Nos. 1-38 within seven days of the Order or as otherwise agreed by the parties.
2. Plaintiff waived all objections to Interrogatory Nos. 7-12 and 16-22 and Requests for Production Nos. 1-38 except objections based on applicable privileges or immunities, subject to objections concerning discovery sought before the deadlines in the Scheduling Order.
3. Plaintiff must complete and sign the authorization forms attached to Defendant's motion, subject to objections based on applicable privileges or immunities.
4. The non-expert discovery deadline was extended to June 18, 2026; all other deadlines remained unchanged.
5. Defendant was entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing the motion to compel, subject to the procedures stated in the Order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A party generally waives all objections, with the exception of those pertaining to any applicable privileges or immunities, where it fails to provide timely discovery responses.” (II)

“Plaintiff shall provide complete responses to Interrogatory Nos. 7-12, 16-22 and Requests for Production Nos. 1-38, as provided in the body of this Order, within 7 days of the date of this Order or as otherwise agreed upon by the parties.” (III)

“IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Defendant is entitled to an award of the reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing its Motion to Compel.” (III)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff brought claims alleging race discrimination and a hostile work environment under Louisiana law and later asserted a Title VII claim. Defendant served 22 interrogatories and 38 requests for production, including requests for authorization forms concerning financial, medical, employment, and tax information. Plaintiff provided only partial responses to some interrogatories and failed to timely respond to the remaining interrogatories and all requests for production, despite repeated efforts by defense counsel to obtain responses.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an employment-discrimination action in state court, and Defendant removed it to the Middle District of Louisiana on May 2, 2025. Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint asserting claims under the Louisiana Employment Discrimination Law and Title VII. After Plaintiff failed to provide timely responses to most written discovery and did not respond to repeated efforts to confer or oppose the motion, Defendant moved to compel.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- In re United States, 864 F.2d 1153, 1156 (5th Cir. 1989)
- B&S Equip. Co. v. Truckle Servs., Inc., No. 09-3862, 2011 WL 2637289, at *6 (E.D. La. July 6, 2011)
- McKnight v. Blanchard, 667 F.2d 477, 481-82 (5th Cir. 1982)
- Raine v. BrandSafeway LLC, No. 24-265, 2024 WL 4256435, at *3 (M.D. La. Sept. 20, 2024)
- Baqer v. St. Tammany Par. Gov't, No. 20-980, 2023 WL 4846828, at *5 (E.D. La. July 28, 2023)
- Zamora v. GC Servs., LP, No. 15-00048, 2016 WL 8853096, at *4 (W.D. Tex. Aug. 19, 2016)
- Pappion v. Phillips 66 Co., No. 19-01098, 2025 WL 1727042, at *6 (W.D. La. June 20, 2025)
- McCoy v. SC Tiger Manor, LLC, No. 19-723, 2021 WL 1321303, at *2 (M.D. La. Apr. 8, 2021)
- Tingle v. Hebert, No. 15-626, 2016 WL 7230499, at *2 (M.D. La. Dec. 14, 2016)
- Wymore v. Nail, No. 14-3493, 2016 WL 1452437, at *1 (W.D. La. Apr. 13, 2016)