

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA, INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

Yvonne L. Davis v. Marion County Superior Court Juvenile
Detention Center, et al.

Davis · No. 1:24-cv-01918-JRS-MJD · Decided December 15, 2025

SUMMARY

This is a court order ruling on a plaintiff's motion for leave to conduct additional discovery and to stay proceedings in response to a summary judgment motion. The court denies the request for additional discovery but grants a brief stay, extending the plaintiff's response deadline.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Indiana, Indianapolis Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Mark J. Dinsmore
JURISDICTION	Southern District of Indiana
DECIDED	December 15, 2025
DOCKET	1:24-cv-01918-JRS-MJD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(d) for leave to conduct additional discovery before responding to Defendants' motion for summary judgment and requested a stay of proceedings while the motion was decided.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(d) and exercised its discretion in determining whether Plaintiff demonstrated good cause for seeking discovery after the discovery deadline.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- summary judgment
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff was entitled under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(d) to conduct additional discovery after the liability-discovery deadline.
2. Whether the proceedings should be stayed or Plaintiff's deadline to respond to Defendants' dispositive motion should be extended while the court considered the motion.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff was not entitled to conduct the requested belated additional discovery because she had not demonstrated good cause for failing to conduct it before the discovery deadline.
2. The court granted Plaintiff's request for additional time and extended her deadline to respond to Defendants' motion for summary judgment from December 15, 2025, to December 22, 2025.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Rule 56(d) is not a license to thwart discovery deadlines.” (Order)

“Plaintiff was not entitled to belatedly conduct the discovery she seeks at the time that Order was issued, and she is not entitled to do so now.” (Order)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sought additional discovery to respond to Defendants' motion for summary judgment after the liability-discovery deadline had expired. The requested discovery had previously been denied, and Plaintiff had not objected to that earlier ruling. Plaintiff also sought a stay or extension of the deadline for responding to Defendants' dispositive motion.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Liability discovery closed on October 10, 2025. The court had previously denied Plaintiff's motion for leave to conduct limited additional written and deposition discovery, and Plaintiff did not object to that order. Plaintiff then filed the present motion, which the court denied insofar as it sought additional discovery but granted insofar as it sought additional time to respond to Defendants' dispositive motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Christensen v. Weiss, 145 F.4th 743, 754-55 (7th Cir. 2025)
- Dakaj v. Holder, 580 F.3d 479, 484 (7th Cir. 2009)
- Gross v. Town of Cicero, Ill., 528 F.3d 498, 499-500 (7th Cir. 2008)

OPINION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA INDIANAPOLIS
DIVISION YVONNE L DAVIS,)) Plaintiff,)) v.) No. 1:24-cv-01918-JRS-MJD) MARION
COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT) JUVENILE DETENTION CENTER, et al.,)) Defendants.)
ORDER This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Conduct Additional
Discovery to Respond to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment and Stay of Proceedings
[sic] Until Plaintiff's Motion Is Decided.

[Dkt. 108.] For the reasons set forth below, the motion is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN
PART. Plaintiff brings this motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(d), seeking
leave to conduct additional discovery before being required to respond to Defendants' summary
judgment motion. Liability discovery in this matter closed on October 10, 2025. [Dkt.

70 at 4.] Rule 56(d) is not a license to thwart discovery deadlines. See generally Christensen v.
Weiss, 145 F.4th 743, 754-55 (7th Cir. 2025). Rather, in order to be entitled to relief under Rule
56(d), Plaintiff would have to demonstrate that she had good cause for not conducting the
discovery at issue prior to that deadline.

The Court already has determined that she did not and explained the reasons for that determination
at length in its Order denying Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Conduct Limited Additional Written
Discovery and Subsequent Oral Deposition Discovery, [Dkt. 93]; Plaintiff did not file an objection
to that Order.

In the interests of judicial economy, the Court will not repeat itself, but rather incorporates that
Order herein in its entirety. Plaintiff was not entitled to belatedly conduct the discovery she seeks
at the time that Order was issued, and she is not entitled to do so now.'

Accordingly, the Court, in its discretion, DENIES Plaintiff's motion to the extent that it seeks leave
to conduct additional discovery. Plaintiff also "respectfully requests the Court stay the proceedings
for the [time] it takes for the Court to rule on Plaintiff's Motion." [Dkt. 108 at 1.]

The Court GRANTS this request. Plaintiffs motion has been pending for five days; accordingly,
Plaintiffs deadline to respond to Defendants' motion for summary judgment is extended from
December 15, 2025 to December 22, 2025. Paragraph IV(C) of the approved Case Management
Plan as amended [Dkts. 23 & 70] is amended as follows: C. Defendants shall file any dispositive
motion on or before November 3, 2025; Plaintiff shall respond to Defendants' dispositive motion,
and shall include any cross-dispositive motion, on or before December 22, 2025; Defendants shall
respond to Plaintiff's cross-dispositive motion, and shall include any reply in support of
Defendants' dispositive motion, on or before January 20, 2026; Plaintiff shall file any reply in
support of her cross-dispositive motion on or before February 3, 2026.

If Plaintiff does not file a cross-dispositive motion, Defendants shall file any reply in support of
their dispositive motion on or before January 12, 2026. All other requirements of the approved

Case Management Plan as amended [Dkts. 23 & 70] remain in effect. SO ORDERED. Dated: 15 DEC 2025 Lf Marl J. Dinsmgre United StatesMagistrate Judge Southern District of Indiana ' Plaintiff argues that "[a] denial of Plaintiff's right to obtain evidence to support her opposition to Defendants [sic] Motion for Summary Judgment amounts to a fundamental denial of due process."

[Dkt. 108 at 5.] However, "[t]he enforcement of procedural deadlines does not violate due process. Indeed, '[c]ourts cannot operate without setting and enforcing deadlines.'" *Dakaj v. Holder*, 580 F.3d 479, 484 (7th Cir. 2009) (quoting *Gross v. Town of Cicero, Ill.*, 528 F.3d 498, 499-500 (7th Cir. 2008)). Distribution: Service will be made electronically on all ECF-registered counsel of record via email generated by the Court's ECF system.