

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Emmanuel A. Lugo v. Concentrix Corporation

Lugo · No. 25-cv-2585 (ECT/JFD) · Decided December 11, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Minnesota denies Emmanuel A. Lugo’s motion to compel discovery because he repeatedly failed to comply with the court’s local rules, including the meet-and-confer requirement. The court also concludes that the motion lacked substantive merit and orders that future noncompliant filings may be summarily denied and subject to a \$100 payment to Concentrix Corporation.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Minnesota
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John F. Docherty
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Minnesota
DECIDED	December 11, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-2585 (ECT/JFD)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to compel discovery. The court canceled the scheduled hearing because the motion was procedurally defective, denied the motion without oral argument, and ordered prospective monetary consequences for future noncompliant filings.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- sanctions
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- discovery
- employment litigation
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Lugo's motion to compel should be denied for failure to comply with the District of Minnesota's filing and meet-and-confer requirements.

2. Whether Concentrix's initial disclosures were inadequate under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1)(A).
3. Whether the court could impose prospective monetary consequences for future filings that violate the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the District of Minnesota Local Rules.

HOLDINGS

1. A motion to compel may be denied when the movant fails to comply with the District of Minnesota's mandatory filing and good-faith meet-and-confer requirements, including by filing the required materials after the motion rather than simultaneously and by failing to discuss the actual discovery dispute with opposing counsel.
2. Rule 26(a)(1)(A) initial disclosures require identification of persons likely to have discoverable information and documents the disclosing party may use to support its claims or defenses, but they do not require disclosure of every conceivably relevant document or person; broader information should generally be sought through targeted discovery requests.
3. The court ordered that future docket filings by Lugo that contravene the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the District of Minnesota Local Rules would be summarily denied and would result in an order requiring Lugo to pay Concentrix \$100 for wasted attorney time.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court requires no oral argument on the motion and denies it due to Mr. Lugo’s persistent violation of the Local Rules of this Court.”

“Rule 26(a)(1)(A) is not designed to compel parties to disclose every conceivably relevant document or person with knowledge, but to give the parties a baseline understanding of the case and its major players in order to craft more targeted requests later in the discovery process.”

“From now on, for every document that Mr. Lugo files on the docket in contravention of those rules, the relief he requests will be summarily denied, and he will be ordered to pay Concentrix \$100 to compensate for the attorney time wasted by his frivolous filings.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Lugo challenged information provided by Concentrix in its initial disclosures under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1). The court found that Lugo had not meaningfully met and conferred about those deficiencies before filing his motion and had repeatedly violated the district’s filing and meet-and-confer rules despite prior admonitions.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Lugo filed a motion to compel discovery on November 26, 2025, without the memorandum and meet-and-confer statement required by District of Minnesota Local Rule 7.1(b)(1). He filed those documents eight days before the scheduled hearing, but the court determined that his meet-and-confer efforts did not address the discovery deficiencies and denied the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Burks v. Abbott Lab'ys*, 2011 WL 13314927, at *8 (D. Minn. July 8, 2011)
- *United States ex rel. Schwartz v. TRW, Inc.*, 211 F.R.D. 388, 392 (C.D. Cal. 2002)
- *Mgmt. Registry, Inc. v. A.W. Cos., Inc.*, 2019 WL 2024538, at *2 (D. Minn. May 8, 2019)
- *Cattanach v. Burlington N. Santa Fe, LLC*, 2014 WL 11429037, at *9 (D. Minn. Sept. 16, 2014)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-minnesota/2025/emmanuel-a-lugo-v-concentrix-corporation-mqweahru>