

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
MISSISSIPPI, OXFORD DIVISION

Brookins v. Oxford School District, et al.

Brookins v. Oxford School District, No. 3:25-cv-205-SA-JMV (N.D. Miss. Apr. 8, 2026) · No. 3:25-cv-205-SA-JMV · Decided April 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The court denied without prejudice the pro se plaintiff’s motion to determine the sufficiency of defendants’ responses to requests for admissions and motion to compel. The court held that the motions were untimely, were filed after the discovery deadline without good cause, and did not comply with applicable conferral and certification requirements, while permitting reconsideration if specified conditions are satisfied.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Oxford Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jane M. Virden
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi, Oxford Division
DECIDED	April 8, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-cv-205-SA-JMV
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to determine the sufficiency of Defendants' responses to requests for admissions and moved to compel discovery responses. The district court denied both motions without prejudice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's motion to determine the sufficiency of Defendants' responses to requests for admissions should be granted when it was filed after the discovery deadline and without compliance with the required conference and certification procedures.
2. Whether Plaintiff's motion to compel should be granted when it was filed after the discovery deadline, without good cause for an extension, without the required meet-and-confer process, and without a Rule 37(a)(1) certification.

HOLDINGS

1. A discovery motion filed after the discovery deadline, without a showing of good cause for extending the deadline, may be denied as untimely under the case management order and Local Civil Rules 7(b)(2)(C) and 7(b)(11).
2. A party seeking discovery relief must comply with the required conference process before filing a motion.
3. A motion to compel must include the certification required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a)(1) showing a good-faith effort to obtain discovery without court action.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“any non-dispositive motion served beyond the motion deadline imposed in the case management order may be denied solely because the motion is not timely served.”

“Plaintiff’s motion to determine sufficiency of Defendants’ responses to requests for admissions [Doc. 32] and Plaintiff’s motion to compel [Doc. 33] are hereby DENIED without prejudice.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff served interrogatories, requests for production, and requests for admission on Defendants shortly before the discovery deadline. Defendants served timely responses and objections on March 6 and March 9, 2026. Plaintiff objected to alleged deficiencies and filed his motions on March 13, after the March 9 discovery deadline, without obtaining an extension, completing the required conference process, or filing a Rule 37(a)(1) certification.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case management order set March 9, 2026, as the discovery deadline. Plaintiff served discovery on February 5, 2026, and amended requests on February 8, 2026; Defendants served responses and objections on March 6 and March 9. Plaintiff filed the motions on March 13, after the discovery deadline, without first completing the required conference process or filing the required good-faith conference certification. The court denied the motions without prejudice and specified conditions for any renewed motions.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- United States ex rel. Jehl v. GGNSC Southaven LLC, No. 3:19-CV-91-MPM-JMV, 2021 WL 2637278, at *1 (N.D. Miss. June 25, 2021)
- Pers. v. Ford Motor Co., 2011 WL 13157355, at *2 (N.D. Miss. Aug. 11, 2011)
- Gueniot-Kornegay v. Blitz U.S.A., Inc., 2013 WL 160259, at *1 (S.D. Miss. Jan. 15, 2013)
- Full House Resorts, Inc. v. Boggs & Poole Contracting Grp., Inc., 2015 WL 4478495, at *3 (S.D. Miss. July 22, 2015)
- Funches v. Mississippi Dev. Auth., 2018 WL 9878315, at *2 (S.D. Miss. Feb. 27, 2018)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-mi/2026/brookins-v-oxford-school-district-et-al-rbgjlv80>