

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Algie Neal v. GMTCare, LLC

Case No. 2:25-cv-01176-APG-NJK, Docket No. 20 · No. 2:25-cv-01176-APG-NJK · Decided January 16, 2026

SUMMARY

The court grants Plaintiff Algie Neal’s motion to compel discovery of contact information for four former employees of Defendant GMTCare, LLC. The parties must confer on confidentiality protections, after which Defendant must provide the information; the court also extends related deposition and case-dispositive deadlines.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Nevada
DECIDED	January 16, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-01176-APG-NJK
DISPOSITION	granted
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to compel Defendant to provide contact information for four former employees in response to a request for production. Defendant opposed the motion, principally seeking confidentiality protections.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Discovery rulings are committed to the broad discretion of the trial court.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Algie Neal v. GMTCare, LLC

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Defendant must provide contact information for four former employees in response to Plaintiff's request for production.
2. Whether disclosure should be conditioned on confidentiality protections.
3. Whether Plaintiff should receive additional time to depose the former employees and whether related case deadlines should be extended.

HOLDINGS

1. The contact information for the four identified former employees is discoverable, and Defendant must provide information within its possession, custody, or control after the parties establish confidentiality protections.
2. Disclosure of the former employees' contact information must occur after the parties confer and put confidentiality protections in place.
3. Plaintiff may depose the four identified former employees by March 20, 2026, and the dispositive-motion and joint proposed pretrial-order deadlines are extended to April 20, 2026, and May 19, 2026, respectively.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The party resisting discovery must specifically detail the reasons why each request is irrelevant or otherwise objectionable, and may not rely on boilerplate, generalized, conclusory, or speculative arguments.” (at 1)

“Accordingly, the motion to compel is GRANTED as follows.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff sought contact information for four of Defendant's former employees so that he could depose them. Defendant initially indicated that the information was discoverable subject to agreed confidentiality protections, but later opposed disclosure and raised additional objections. The court concluded that the contact information was discoverable subject to confidentiality protections and that the parties should confer regarding those protections.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The motion to compel was pending before the United States District Court for the District of Nevada. The court resolved the motion without a hearing, granted it subject to the parties' adoption of confidentiality protections, and extended certain discovery and pretrial deadlines.

DISPOSITION

granted

CASES CITED

- Hallett v. Morgan, 296 F.3d 732, 751 (9th Cir. 2002)

- Crawford-El v. Britton, 523 U.S. 574, 598 (1998)
- V5 Techs. v. Switch, Ltd., 334 F.R.D. 306, 309 (D. Nev. 2019)
- Blankenship v. Hearst Corp., 519 F.2d 418, 429 (9th Cir. 1975)
- F.T.C. v. AMG Servs., Inc., 291 F.R.D. 544, 553 (D. Nev. 2013)
- E.E.O.C. v. Caesars Ent., 237 F.R.D. 428, 432 (D. Nev. 2006)
- Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007)
- V5 Techs. v. Switch, Ltd., 334 F.R.D. 297, 302 (D. Nev. 2019)

OPINION

1 2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 3 DISTRICT OF NEVADA 4 5 Algie Neal, Case No. 2:25-cv-01176-APG-NJK 6 Plaintiff(s), Order 7 v. [Docket No. 20] 8 GMTCCare, LLC, 9 Defendant(s). 10 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to compel. Docket No. 20.1 Defendant filed 11 a response in opposition. Docket No. 21. No reply was filed.

The motion is properly resolved 12 without a hearing. See Local Rule 78-1. 13 "[B]road discretion is vested in the trial court to permit or deny discovery." Hallett v. 14 Morgan, 296 F.3d 732, 751 (9th Cir. 2002); see also Crawford-El v. Britton, 523 U.S. 574, 598 15 (1998). When a party fails to provide discovery, the requesting party may move to compel it.

Fed. 16 R. Civ. P. 37(a). The party seeking to avoid discovery bears the burden of showing why the 17 discovery should not be permitted. V5 Techs. v. Switch, Ltd., 334 F.R.D. 306, 309 (D. Nev. 2019) 18 (citing Blankenship v. Hearst Corp., 519 F.2d 418, 429 (9th Cir. 1975)).

The party resisting 19 discovery must specifically detail the reasons why each request is irrelevant or otherwise 20 objectionable, and may not rely on boilerplate, generalized, conclusory, or speculative arguments. 21 F.T.C. v. AMG Servs., Inc., 291 F.R.D. 544, 553 (D. Nev. 2013). Arguments against discovery 22 must be supported by "specific examples and articulated reasoning." E.E.O.C. v. Caesars Ent., 23 237 F.R.D.

428, 432 (D. Nev. 2006). 24 The dispute before the Court is whether Defendant must provide contact information for 25 four of Defendant's former employees as sought in Plaintiff's request for production 1. Docket 26 No. 20 at 2-3; see also id. at 8.

In responding to that request, Defendant asserted that such 27 1 The Court liberally construes the filings of pro se litigants. Erickson v. Pardus, 551 U.S. 28 89, 94 (2007). 1} disclosure would be improper without agreed-upon confidentiality protections. /d. Defendant also 2|| represented that it would meet-and-confer regarding disclosure of contact information subject to confidentiality safeguards.

Jd. Although Defendant now attempts to change gears," the Court 4] agrees with its initial position that the information is discoverable subject to confidentiality 5] protections. It is not clear why the

parties have not engaged in discussions regarding those 6] confidentiality protections so that this information can be provided. 7 Accordingly, the motion to compel is GRANTED as follows.

The parties must confer on 8] confidentiality protections. Once such protections are in place, Defendant must provide the contact information that is within its possession, custody, or control as to these four former employees. Defendant must provide the contact information within seven days of entry of the confidentiality 11] protections. Plaintiff seeks the contact information to depose the former employees.

Docket No. 12] 20 at 2. Discovery will close as a general matter on January 19, 2026. See Docket No. 172 13] Nonetheless, Plaintiff is permitted to depose the four identified former employees by March 20, 14] 2026. The Court extends the dispositive motion deadline to April 20, 2026, and the joint proposed 15] pretrial order deadline to May 19, 2026.4 16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: January 16, 2026. 19 United States Judge 20 21 22? The Court is not persuaded by Defendant's cursory contentions that it is not required to provide the contact information, argument that is not well-developed and is not consistent with its 23} actual response to the discovery request. See Docket No. 21 at 3-4.

The Court is also not persuaded by Defendant's contention concerning the lack of a meet-and-confer given that Plaintiff appears to have attempted to confer and the issue appears primed for resolution at any rate. Cf *V5 Techs. 55 v. Switch, Ltd.*, 334 F.R.D. 297, 302 (D. Nev. 2019). > The deadlines to amend, to add parties, for initial experts, and for rebuttal experts are 26] closed and remain closed.

See Docket No. 17. 27 * It appears the motion may intend to seek relief beyond what is discussed herein. Any other relief is denied without prejudice to bringing a separate motion supported by points and 28] authorities, as well as meaningful argument. See, e.g., Local Rule IC 2-2(b).