

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, ORLANDO DIVISION

Paulo Oliveira v. American Airlines, Inc.

Oliveira · No. 6:25-cv-1133-CEM-LHP · Decided February 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida denied Paulo Oliveira’s motion to compel supplemental discovery responses and document production without prejudice. The court found that the motion exceeded applicable word limits, failed to attach the discovery requests and responses at issue, and did not comply with the requirements for conferral under the standing discovery-motions order and local rules.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Orlando Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Leslie A. Price
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida
DECIDED	February 6, 2026
DOCKET	6:25-cv-1133-CEM-LHP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to compel supplemental discovery responses and production of documents. The district court denied the motion without prejudice because it failed to comply with the court's Standing Order on Discovery Motions and applicable procedural requirements.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the discovery motion for compliance with the Standing Order on Discovery Motions, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and the Local Rules.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished, nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Paulo Oliveira v. American Airlines, Inc.

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's motion to compel should be granted when it exceeds the applicable word limit, fails to attach the discovery requests and responses at issue, and does not demonstrate compliance with the required conferral procedure.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion to compel was denied without prejudice because it did not comply with the Standing Order on Discovery Motions and applicable procedural rules.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“subject to the relevant law and rules of court, including the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure” (Order)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sought an order compelling supplemental discovery responses and production of documents from American Airlines. The motion exceeded the applicable word limitation and failed to attach the discovery requests and responses at issue. The motion also indicated that the parties' required conferral may have occurred solely by email and that the conferral information was improperly embedded in the motion and supplied by attachment.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a motion to compel supplemental discovery responses and document production. The court denied the motion without prejudice because it exceeded the word limit, did not attach the discovery requests and responses at issue, and did not demonstrate a compliant conference between the parties. The court permitted a renewed motion if it fully complies with the Standing Order on Discovery Motions, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and the Local Rules.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

No remand was ordered. Any renewed motion to compel must fully comply with the Standing Order on Discovery Motions, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and the Local Rules.

CASES CITED

- Moon v. Newsome, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989)

OPINION

Oliveira

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

ORLANDO DIVISION

PAULO OLIVEIRA,

Plaintiff, v. Case No: 6:25-cv-1133-CEM-LHP

AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC.,

Defendant

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Supplemental Discovery Responses and Production of Documents. Doc. No. 57. On review, the motion is DENIED without prejudice for failure to comply with the Standing Order on Discovery Motions. See Doc. No. 54. First, the motion exceeds the word limitations for a discovery motion. See id. ¶ 2. Second, the motion fails to attach the discovery requests and responses at issue. See id. ¶ 3. Third, the motion suggests (by Local Rule 3.01(g) conferral improperly imbedded in the middle of the motion and by attachment, see Local Rule 3.01(g)(2), Doc. No. 57, at 3; Doc. No. 57- 2), that the parties conferred solely via email. See id. ¶ 1. Any renewed motion must comply in full with the Standing Order on Discovery Motions (Doc. No. 54) and all applicable Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules. See also *Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 863 (1989) (pro se litigants are "subject to the relevant law and rules of court, including the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure"). DONE and ORDERED in Orlando, Florida on February 6, 2026.

LESLIE 3 AN PRICE

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Copies furnished to: Counsel of Record Unrepresented Parties