

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential procedural order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)