

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION**

Plaintiff(s)	:	Case No. _____
v.	:	Chief Judge Sandra S. Beckwith
Defendant(s)	:	<b>JOINT DISCOVERY PLAN</b> (RULE 26(f) REPORT) (REQUIRED FORM)

Now come all parties to this case, by and through their respective counsel, and hereby jointly submit to the Court this Joint Discovery Plan, pursuant to the Court's Trial Procedure Order. The parties conducted their discovery conference on \_\_\_\_\_.

**A. MAGISTRATE JUDGE CONSENT**

The Parties:

- unanimously consent to the jurisdiction of the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (c)
- do not unanimously consent to the jurisdiction of the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (c)
- unanimously give contingent consent to the jurisdiction of the United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (c), for trial purposes only, in the event that the District Judge assigned is unavailable on the date set for trial (e.g. because of other trial settings, civil or criminal)

**B. RULE 26(a) DISCLOSURES**

- The parties have exchanged pre-discovery disclosures required by Rule 26(a)(1)
- The parties will exchange such disclosures by \_\_\_\_\_
- The parties are exempt from disclosures under Rule 26(a)(1)(E)

NOTE: Rule 26(a) disclosures are not to be filed with the Court

**C. DISCOVERY ISSUES AND DATES**

1. Discovery will need to be conducted on the issues of  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. The parties recommend that discovery
  - need not be bifurcated
  - should be bifurcated between liability and damages
  - should be bifurcated between factual and expert
  - should be limited in some fashion or focused upon particular issues which relate to \_\_\_\_\_
3. Disclosure and report of Plaintiff(s) expert(s) by \_\_\_\_\_
4. Disclosure and report of Defendant(s) expert(s) by \_\_\_\_\_
5. Disclosure and report of rebuttal expert(s) by \_\_\_\_\_
6. Disclosure of non-expert (fact) witnesses \_\_\_\_\_
7. Discovery cutoff \_\_\_\_\_
8. Anticipated discovery problems
  - \_\_\_\_\_
  - None

**D. LIMITATIONS ON DISCOVERY**

1. Changes in the limitations on discovery

- Extension of time limitations (currently one day of seven hours) in taking of depositions to \_\_\_\_\_
- Extension of number of depositions (currently 10) permitted to \_\_\_\_\_
- Extension of number of interrogatories (currently 25) to \_\_\_\_\_
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_.
- None

**E. PROTECTIVE ORDER**

- A protective order will likely be submitted to the Court on or before \_\_\_\_\_
- The parties currently do not anticipate the need for a protective order. If the parties subsequently deem that one is necessary, they will submit a joint proposed order to the Court. Such order will be in compliance with *Procter & Gamble Co. v. Bankers Trust Co.*, 78 F. 3d 219 (6th Cir. 1996)

**F. SETTLEMENT**

A settlement demand \_\_\_\_\_ has \_\_\_\_\_ has not been made

A response \_\_\_\_\_ has \_\_\_\_\_ has not been made

A demand can be made by \_\_\_\_\_

A response can be made by \_\_\_\_\_

**G. MOTION DEADLINES**

1. Motion to amend the pleadings and/or add parties by \_\_\_\_\_
2. Motions relative to the pleadings by \_\_\_\_\_
3. Dispositive motions by \_\_\_\_\_

**H. OTHER MATTERS PERTINENT TO MANAGEMENT OF THIS LITIGATION**

---

---

---

Signatures:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Attorney for: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Attorney for: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Attorney for: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Attorney for: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_