

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION

Susan Locke v. Oakland County, et al.

Locke · No. 2:25-cv-11262 · Decided February 17, 2026

SUMMARY

This is an order from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan directing the parties to meet and confer regarding a motion to compel discovery. The order requires the parties to file a joint list of unresolved discovery issues by April 1, 2026, and sets a hearing for April 7, 2026; it was entered by Magistrate Judge Elizabeth A. Stafford on February 17, 2026.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Elizabeth A. Stafford
DECIDED	February 17, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-11262
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to compel defendants to produce additional documents and more complete discovery responses. The district judge referred the nondispositive discovery motion to the magistrate judge for hearing and determination under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). Rather than immediately decide the motion, the magistrate judge ordered the parties to meet and confer and submit a joint list of unresolved discovery issues before the hearing.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Objections to the magistrate judge's order on a nondispositive motion may be sustained only if the order is clearly erroneous or contrary to law under Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 636.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Susan Locke v. Oakland County, et al.

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. What meet-and-confer and joint-submission procedures should govern the parties' dispute over plaintiff's motion to compel?
2. What standards must the parties apply when describing discovery requests, asserting objections, addressing relevance and proportionality, claiming burden or privilege, and discussing electronically stored information?

HOLDINGS

1. The parties must meet and confer in good faith in person or by video as required by E.D. Mich. LR 37.1, and must file a joint list of unresolved discovery issues before the hearing.
2. The parties' arguments must address relevance to a specific claim or defense and the proportionality factors under the current version of Rule 26(b)(1); document requests must describe the requested items with reasonable particularity, and objections must be stated with specificity.
3. A party objecting that document production is burdensome must provide affidavits, other evidence, or sufficient information for the court to make a common-sense judgment; boilerplate objections and objections coupled with production may be deemed waived.
4. A responding party claiming privilege must provide a privilege log satisfying Rule 26(b)(5)(A)(ii), and the parties must engage in informed, cooperative, and transparent discussions concerning the search for electronically stored information.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"The parties' arguments must address relevance to a specific claim or defense, and the proportionality factors under Federal Rule of Civil Rule 26(b)(1)." (Order to Meet and Confer)

"A party either objects to production or produces. If it produces, the objections are generally deemed waived." (Order to Meet and Confer)

"The parties must engage informed, cooperative, and transparent discussions about the search for electronically stored information." (Order to Meet and Confer)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sought additional documents and more complete discovery responses from defendants. The court required the parties to confer about the disputed requests, responses, objections, relevance, proportionality, privilege, and electronically stored information. The order was issued before the scheduled hearing on the motion to compel and required a joint submission identifying any remaining disputes.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Susan Locke filed a motion to compel, and the motion was referred by Judge Linda V. Parker to Magistrate Judge Elizabeth A. Stafford. The court ordered the parties to meet and confer in person or by video, address each unresolved discovery request and response in detail, and file a joint list by April 1, 2026. A hearing on the motion to compel was scheduled for April 7, 2026.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Helena Agri-Enterprises, LLC v. Great Lakes Grain, LLC, 988 F.3d 260, 273 (6th Cir. 2021)
- Weidman v. Ford Motor Company, No. CV 18-12719, 2021 WL 2349400, at *3 (E.D. Mich. June 9, 2021)
- Cratty v. City of Wyandotte, 296 F. Supp. 3d 854, 858 (E.D. Mich. Nov. 8, 2017)
- United States v. Quicken Loans, Inc., No. 16-CV-14050, 2018 WL 7351682, at *1 (E.D. Mich. June 5, 2018)
- Cheney v. U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, 542 U.S. 367, 387-388 (2004)
- Effyis, Inc. v. Kelly, No. 18-13391, 2020 WL 4915559, at *2 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 21, 2020)
- In re Heparin Products Liability Litigation, 273 F.R.D. 399, 410-11 (N.D. Ohio 2011)
- Vallejo v. Amgen, Inc., 903 F.3d 733, 743-44 (8th Cir. 2018)
- Siser N. Am., Inc. v. Herika G. Inc., 325 F.R.D. 200, 209-10 (E.D. Mich. 2018)
- Aprile Horse Transp., Inc. v. Prestige Delivery Sys., Inc., No. 5:13-CV-15-GNS-LLK, 2015 WL 4068457, at *3 (W.D. Ky. July 2, 2015)
- Riley v. NewPenn Kilt, LLC, No. 518CV00014TBRHBB, 2020 WL 59838, at *2 n.1 (W.D. Ky. Jan. 6, 2020)
- Lucas v. Protective Life Insurance Co., No. CIV.A.4:08CV00059-JH, 2010 WL 569743, at *3 (W.D. Ky. Feb. 11, 2010)
- Johnson v. Serenity Transportation, Inc., No. 15-CV-02004-JSC, 2016 WL 6393521, at *2 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 28, 2016)
- Waskul v. Washtenaw County Community Mental Health, 569 F. Supp. 3d 626, 634 (E.D. Mich. 2021)
- Lyman v. Ford Motor Co., 344 F.R.D. 228, 230 (E.D. Mich. 2023)
- Powell v. Hackel, No. 20-13318, 2022 WL 22628807, at *1 (E.D. Mich. Jan. 12, 2022)