

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
OKLAHOMA

Jennifer Coy v. Amazon Logistics, Inc. and John Doe

Coy · No. 25-cv-345-RAW-GLJ · Decided April 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The court grants in part and denies in part Amazon Logistics, Inc.’s motion to compel Jennifer Coy to appear for deposition. The court requires Coy to make herself available for deposition on a mutually agreeable date within 21 days, but declines to award attorney’s fees and expenses because both parties failed to fully comply with discovery obligations.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Gerald L. Jackson
JURISDICTION	U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma
DECIDED	April 16, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-345-RAW-GLJ
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant Amazon Logistics, Inc. moved to compel Plaintiff to appear for a deposition and sought attorney's fees and costs. The motion was referred to the magistrate judge for pretrial and discovery matters.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and local discovery rules governing deposition notice, service, motions to compel, and sanctions.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; unpublished federal district court order.

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- sanctions
- service of process
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Amazon was entitled to an order compelling Plaintiff to appear for a deposition when Amazon unilaterally noticed a deposition date before the discovery deadline and Plaintiff did not provide available dates or seek a protective order.
2. Whether Amazon was entitled to attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing the motion to compel.
3. Whether the deposition notice was properly served when it was sent by email and the record did not establish Plaintiff's written consent to electronic service under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5(a)(1)(E).

HOLDINGS

1. The motion to compel was granted in part: Plaintiff was required to make herself available for deposition on a mutually agreeable date within twenty-one days of the order, but no other discovery could occur after the discovery deadline without leave of court.
2. The court denied Amazon's request for attorney's fees and costs because an award would be unjust in light of both parties' failure to fully comply with their discovery obligations.
3. The court found it unclear whether the deposition notice was properly served because Amazon served it by email without establishing Plaintiff's written consent to electronic service under Rule 5(a)(1)(E).

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In sum, neither party engaged in discovery in this matter in a manner required under the rules and dictated by professional courtesy and customary practice before this Court.” (Analysis)

“All parties are expected to cooperate in discovery, including the scheduling of depositions at agreeable times within scheduled deadlines, and to seek Court intervention only after a fulsome and meaningful meet and confer is unable to resolve the disagreement.” (Analysis)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The action arose from an accident in Wagoner County, Oklahoma, on July 23, 2023. Amazon requested deposition dates from Plaintiff's counsel on March 12, 2026, but Plaintiff provided no dates before the April 2 discovery deadline. Amazon then noticed Plaintiff's deposition for April 2 at counsel's Tulsa office and served the notice by email, despite Plaintiff and her counsel stating they were unavailable. Neither party fully complied with the court's expectations for cooperative scheduling and a meaningful meet and confer.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed an amended petition in Wagoner County District Court, and Amazon removed the action to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma. Amazon sought deposition dates before the discovery deadline, later noticed Plaintiff's deposition unilaterally, and moved to compel after Plaintiff and her counsel stated they were unavailable. The court granted the motion in part by requiring Plaintiff to appear for a deposition on a mutually agreeable date within twenty-one days, denied the request for fees and expenses, and prohibited other discovery after the deadline absent leave of court.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Paycom Payroll, LLC v. Boodoosingh, 502 P.3d 737, 744 (Okla. Civ. App. 2021)
- Smith v. Ford Motor Co., 626 F.2d 784, 797 (10th Cir. 1980)
- Hancock v. Greystar Management Serv., L.P., 2016 WL 2889048, at *1 (W.D. Okla. May 17, 2016)
- McKinney v. Reassure Am. Life Ins. Co., 2006 WL 3228791, at *2 (E.D. Okla. Nov. 2, 2006)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-okl/2026/jennifer-coy-v-amazon-logistics-inc-and-john-doe-s075x4h9>