

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

James Laughridge v. Brandon Stahl, Courtney Parenti, Joseph
Lundy and John Doe

Laughridge · No. 6:25-cv-2126-CEM-LHP · Decided December 8, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida denied James Laughridge’s motion for early discovery seeking to identify a John Doe defendant. The court denied the motion without prejudice because it lacked the memorandum of law required by Local Rule 3.01(b) and did not cite legal authority establishing entitlement to the requested discovery.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Orlando Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Leslie A. N. Price
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Orlando Division
DECIDED	December 8, 2025
DOCKET	6:25-cv-2126-CEM-LHP
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for early discovery to identify the John Doe defendant. The district court denied the motion without prejudice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	James Laughridge v. Brandon Stahl, Courtney Parenti, Joseph Lundy, John Doe

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the plaintiff's motion for early discovery to identify a John Doe defendant should be granted when the motion does not include the memorandum of law required by Local Rule 3.01(b) or cite legal authority supporting the requested discovery.

HOLDINGS

1. A motion for early discovery may be denied without prejudice when the movant fails to provide the memorandum of law required by Local Rule 3.01(b) and fails to demonstrate through legal authority an entitlement to the requested discovery.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“is subject to the relevant law and rules of court, including the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.” (837)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff James Laughridge sued several named defendants and an unidentified John Doe defendant. He moved for early discovery to determine the Doe defendant's identity, but the motion did not explain with legal authority why he was entitled to that discovery.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was pending in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida. Plaintiff sought early discovery to identify an unnamed defendant, but the court denied the motion without prejudice because it lacked the memorandum of law required by Local Rule 3.01(b).

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

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

OPINION

Laughridge
PER CURIAM.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
ORLANDO DIVISION
JAMES LAUGHRIDGE,
Plaintiff, v. Case No: 6:25-cv-2126-CEM-LHP
BRANDON STAHL, COURTNEY
PARENTI, JOSEPH LUNDY and

JOHN DOE,

Defendants

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Early Discovery to Identify John Doe Defendant. On review, the motion is DENIED without prejudice for failure to provide a memorandum of law as required by Local Rule 3.01(b). Specifically, the motion fails to demonstrate, with citation to legal authority, why plaintiff is entitled to the early discovery he seeks. See *Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (a pro se litigant "is subject to the relevant law and rules of court, including the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure."), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 863 (1989). DONE and ORDERED in Orlando, Florida on December 8, 2025. ayn □□□□

LESLIE AN PRICE

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Copies furnished to: Counsel of Record Unrepresented Parties fy