## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION AT CINCINNATI

			:	Case No. 1:cv
		Plaintiff(s),	:	Judge Matthew W. McFarland
V.		:		
		Defendant(s).	:	
	JOINT	DISCOVERY PLAN I	PURSU	ANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 26(f)
	All parties	to this case, by and thr	ough tl	neir respective counsel, jointly submit
this Jo	oint Discove	ry Plan pursuant to Fe	d. R. Ci	v. P. 26(f) and the Court's Standing
Orde	r Regarding	Procedures in Civil Ca	ses. Th	e parties held their discovery conference
on	, 20	<u>_</u> .		
A.	MAGISTR	ATE CONSENT		
	The parties	:		
		nimously consent to thge under 28 U.S.C. § 63		liction of the United States Magistrate
		not unanimously conse gistrate Judge under 28		ne jurisdiction of the United States 636(c).
	Judg	ge under 28 U.S.C. § 63	66(c) sol	liction of the United States Magistrate ely for purposes of deciding the tive motions:

	□ Unanimously give contingent consent to the jurisdiction of the United States Magistrate Judge under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) for trial purposes only if the District Judge assigned is unavailable on the date set for trial (e.g., because of other trial settings, civil or criminal).
В.	RULE 26(a) DISCLOSURES
	$\square$ The parties have exchanged pre-discovery disclosures required by Rule 26(a)(1).
	☐ The parties will exchange such disclosures by
	$\Box$ 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
	$\square$ need not be bifurcated.
	☐ Should be bifurcated between liability and damages.
	☐ Should be bifurcated between factual and expert.
	☐ Should be limited to or focused upon issues relating to
	<b>3.</b> Disclosure and report of Plaintiff(s) expert(s) by

4.	Disclosure and report by Defendant(s) expert(s) by
5.	Disclosure and report of rebuttal expert(s) by
6.	Disclosure of non-expert (fact) witnesses by
7.	Discovery cut-off
8.	Anticipated discovery problems
	□ None.
9.	Describe the subjects on which discovery is to be sought and the nature, extent and scope of discovery that each party needs to: (1) make a settlement evaluation, (2) prepare for case dispositive motions, and (3) prepare for trial:
10	<ul> <li>Discovery of Electronically Stored Information. The parties have discussed disclosure, discovery, and preservation of electronically stored information, including the form or forms in which it should be produced.</li> <li>☐ Yes</li> </ul>
	□ No

i.	The parties have electronically stored information in the following formats:
ii.	The case presents the following issues relating to disclosure, discovery, or preservation of electronically stored information, including the form or forms in which it should be produced:
regarding th product doc	rivilege or Protection. The parties have discussed issues e protection of information by a privilege or the worktrine, including whether the parties agree to a procedure to claims after production or have any other agreements under 502.
□ Yes	
□ No	
i.	The case presents the following issues relating to claims of privilege or of protection as trial preparation materials:

ii. Have the parties agreed on a procedure to assert such claims
AFTER production?
□ No
□ Yes
☐ Yes, and the parties ask that the Court include the following agreement in the scheduling order:
D. <u>LIMITATIONS ON DISCOVERY</u>
1. Change in the limitations on discovery
☐ Increase the amount of time (currently 1 day of 7 hours) permitted
in which to complete depositions to
$\hfill\square$ Increase the number of depositions (currently 10) permitted to
☐ Increase the number of interrogatories (currently 25) permitted to
□ None.

Ŀ.	PROTECTIVE ORDER			
	A protective order will 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 comply with <i>Procter &amp; Gamble Co. v. Bankers Trust Co.</i> , 78 F.3d 219 (6th Cir. 1996) and its progeny.			
F.	<u>SETTLEMENT</u>			
	A settlement demand $\square$ has or $\square$ has not been made.			
	A response to the demand $\square$ has or $\square$ 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			
	<b>2.</b> Motions related to the pleadings by			
	3. Dispositive motions by			
Н.	OTHER MATTERS			

Signatures:			
	Attorney for Plaintiff(s)		Attorney for Defendant(s)
		•	