

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF
MASSACHUSETTS

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

Kingston · No. No. 24-cv-12021-DJC · Decided February 25, 2026

SUMMARY

This procedural order addresses an email request treated as a motion for clarification in Aimee L. Kingston v. Gregory Strange and related defendants. The order discusses a pending sanctions motion, reply briefs, discovery procedures and deadlines, document production, accommodations, and procedures for objections to the magistrate judge’s order.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Paul G. Levenson
DECIDED	February 25, 2026
DOCKET	No. 24-cv-12021-DJC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court treated the plaintiff's email request, Docket No. 93, as a motion for clarification and issued a procedural order addressing a pending sanctions motion, reply-brief practice, discovery issues, and document production.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a) and the applicable local rule, a district judge will set aside a magistrate judge's order only if it is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential procedural order
PARTIES	Aimee L. Kingston v. Gregory Strange, Frank Caridi, Kevin Grenier, Stephanie Danielson, Connor Read, Dottie Fulginiti, Peter Deschenes, Robert Stetson, Christopher Anderson, Deborah Balcarek, Amos Keddem

TOPICS

discovery dispute

sanctions

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

discovery

sanctions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiff's email request should be treated as a motion for clarification and what clarification was required regarding the pending sanctions motion.
2. Whether the plaintiff's reply brief would be considered and whether future reply briefs required leave of court under the local rules.
3. What procedures governed future discovery disputes and document production.
4. What deadline governed completion of the plaintiff's deposition.

HOLDINGS

1. The court treated the plaintiff's email request, Docket No. 93, as a motion for clarification.
2. The court would rule on the pending sanctions motion in due course, without further briefing or hearing anticipated, and would address Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 as appropriate; no further submission concerning Rule 11 was required.
3. The plaintiff's existing reply brief would be considered in connection with the sanctions motion, but future reply briefs required prior leave of court under Local Rule 7.1(b)(3), except that the requirement does not apply to replies filed in connection with a motion for summary judgment under Local Rule 56.1.
4. Before filing future discovery-related motions, the parties must contact the deputy clerk to arrange a supervised Local Rule 37.1 conference.
5. Pursuant to the discovery order issued after the status conference, the plaintiff's deposition had to be completed by close of business on Friday, March 20, 2026.
6. The parties were instructed to provide copies of responsive documents to the opposing parties, with the mode and manner of production generally governed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“For any discovery issues that arise in the future, the parties are instructed to contact the Deputy Clerk, Alexandra. Traganos, to arrange for a supervised conference (Local Rule 37.1 conference), prior to filing any future discovery related motions.” (Procedural Order § III)

“The Court will rule on the Motion for Sanctions (Docket No. 83) in due course—no further briefing or hearing is anticipated, and no postponement has been ordered.” (Procedural Order § I)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The parties had pending discovery disputes and had participated in a February 19, 2026 status conference. The court had set a discovery-compliance schedule, including a requirement that the plaintiff's deposition be completed by close of business on March 20, 2026. The plaintiff also had a pending sanctions motion and had filed a reply brief without first obtaining leave of court.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was pending in the District of Massachusetts before Magistrate Judge Paul G. Levenson. The court had conducted a February 19, 2026 status conference, issued a discovery order at Docket No. 92, and had before it a sanctions motion at Docket No. 83 and the plaintiff's reply brief at Docket No. 89. The court clarified the status of those matters and established or reiterated procedural requirements and deadlines.

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)

OPINION

Kingston

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

AIMEE L KINGSTON,

Plaintiff, v.

GREGORY STRANGE, FRANK CARIDI,

KEVIN GRENIER, STEPHANIE No. 24-cv-12021-DJC

DANIELSON, CONNOR READ, DOTTIE

FULGINITI, PETER DESCHENES, ROBERT

STETSON, CHRISTOPHER ANDERSON,

DEBORAH BALCAREK, and AMOS

KEDDEM,

Defendants.

PROCEDURAL ORDER

LEVENSON, U.S.M.J. Treating the email request of Ms. Kingston (Docket No. 93) as a motion for clarification, the Court notes as follows: I. Pending Sanctions Motion The Court will rule on the Motion for Sanctions (Docket No. 83) in due course—no further briefing or hearing is anticipated, and no postponement has been ordered. Plaintiff has already raised Federal Rule of

Civil Procedure 11 as a proposed basis for sanctions and the Court will address it as appropriate. No further submission is required in that regard. If the Court determines that oral argument on any motion is appropriate, the parties will be notified. II. Reply Briefs Plaintiff's Reply Brief (Docket No. 89) is before the Court and will be considered in connection with Plaintiff's motion for sanctions. In the future, pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(b)(3) of the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, the parties shall seek leave of Court before filing any reply brief.¹ III. Additional Discovery Issues • No further submissions are required, or expected, with respect to any of the discovery issues that parties discussed at the February 19, 2026, status conference. The Court heard from the parties regarding pending discovery issues and has set a schedule for compliance. • For any discovery issues that arise in the future, the parties are instructed to contact the Deputy Clerk, Alexandra. Traganos, to arrange for a supervised conference (Local Rule 37.1 conference), prior to filing any future discovery related motions. • A wide range of discovery issues may be raised before the court during a discovery conference, and matters discussed are part of the record that the Court considers when setting schedules and ruling on motions. • The Court did not address any request for accommodation, except to note that arrangements can be made to permit Plaintiff to bring an electronic device (i.e. cell phone, laptop) into the Courthouse for hearings. That request may be made by email to the Deputy Clerk. 1 This requirement does not apply to replies filed in connection with a motion for summary judgment. See Local Rule 56.1. At the status conference, the Court noted that the parties should arrange a deposition schedule that permits Plaintiff to take breaks or otherwise proceed in multiple days. Other than that recommendation, it is for the parties to work out timing, in accordance with the schedule ordered by the Court. Pursuant to the discovery order issued by the Court following the status conference (Docket No. 92), Plaintiff's deposition must be completed by Close of Business Friday, March 20, 2026. • The standards the Court will apply to consideration of discovery disputes are based on the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules of the Court, and associated case law. IV. Responses to Requests for Production of Documents: The parties are instructed to provide copies of responsive documents to the opposing part(ies). Factual assertions at issue in the case may be addressed in depositions, narrowed requests for admissions, or other discovery methods. The mode and manner of production are generally dictated by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

SO ORDERED.²

/s/ Paul G. Levenson Paul G. Levenson

U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated: February 25, 2026 ² The parties are advised that under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a) or Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 59(a), and under Rule 2(b) of the Rules for United States Magistrate Judges in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, any party seeking review by a district judge of these determination(s) and order(s) must serve and file any objections within 14 days of receiving this order, unless a different time is prescribed by the magistrate judge or a district judge. Such objections must specifically designate the order, or part

thereof, to be modified or set aside and the basis for objection. The district judge will set aside any portion of the magistrate judge's order that is found to be clearly erroneous or contrary to law. The parties are further advised that failing to follow the objection procedures of Rule 2(b) may preclude further appellate review. See *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).