

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

BROCK STONE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:17-cv-02459

SCHEDULING ORDER

This scheduling order is being entered pursuant to Local Rule 103.9. Any inquiries concerning the schedule should be directed to my chambers, not to the Clerk's Office. Any party who believes that any deadline set forth in this Scheduling Order is unreasonable may request in writing a modification of the Order or that a conference be held for the purpose of seeking a modification of the Order. **The schedule will not be changed except for good cause.**

This case is subject to electronic filing. Please familiarize yourself with the procedures for electronic filing available at: www.mdd.uscourts.gov. You must use the electronic filing system for filing documents with the Clerk and sending case-related correspondence to chambers. **When you electronically file a document that, including attachments, is 15 pages or longer, you must also provide me a paper copy of the document and a paper copy of the notice of electronic filing.** The paper copy should be sent to my chambers directly.

At this time, the parties do not consent to proceed before a United States Magistrate Judge.

I. DEADLINES¹

January 2–9, 2018:	First sets of requests for production of documents and interrogatories
January 9, 2018:	Joint Status Report setting forth a detailed Joint Discovery Plan, including a joint plan or stipulation for handling e-discovery, if necessary

¹ An asterisk next to a deadline means “no later than.”

	*Motions for joinder of additional parties and amendment of pleadings
	*Parties' Rule 26(a)(1) initial disclosures
March 2, 2018:	Proponent's Rule 26(a)(2) disclosures
March 30, 2018:	Opponent's Rule 26(a)(2) disclosures
April 6, 2018:	Reply Rule 26(a)(2) disclosures
April 24, 2018:	*Discovery-related motions filed
April 24, 2018:	Discovery deadline
May 1, 2018:	Status hearing with Court
May 25, 2018:	Dispositive pretrial motions

II. DISCOVERY

Procedure

All the provisions of Local Rule 104 apply, including the following:

- a. All discovery requests must be served in time to assure that they are answered before the discovery deadline. An extension of the deadline will not be granted because of unanswered discovery requests.
- b. The existence of a discovery dispute as to one matter does not justify delay in taking any other discovery. The filing of a motion to compel or a motion for a protective order will not result in a general extension of the discovery deadline.
- c. No discovery materials, including Rule 26(a)(1) and Rule 26(a)(2) disclosures, should be filed with the court.
- d. Motions to compel shall be filed in accordance with Local Rule 104.8 and the applicable CM/ECF procedures.
- e. Please be familiar with the Discovery Guidelines of this Court which are Appendix A to the Local Rules. Appendix D contains guidelines for form discovery requests and confidentiality orders that may be helpful to you.

Privilege Issues

If a party asserts any privilege in its responses to written discovery requests, a complete and detailed privilege log shall be served no later than two business days after the date that the party's discovery response was due.

Number of Depositions

Each side (Plaintiffs and Defendants) is limited to **15** depositions, subject to the clarification in the following section ("Discovery Coordination"). A 30(b)(6) deposition accounts for one deposition slot, even if the recipient of the 30(b)(6) notice designates more than one individual to testify on the topics requested.

Discovery Coordination

This case is one of four pending lawsuits challenging President Trump's August 25 directives regarding military service by individuals who are transgender ("Related Cases"). The Related Cases are, in addition to this case: (i) *Doe v. Trump*, No. 17-cv-1597 (D.D.C.); (ii) *Karnoski v. Trump*, No. 17-cv-1297 (W.D. Wash.); and (iii) *Stockman v. Trump*, No. 17-cv-1799 (C.D. Cal.). Discovery produced (including deposition testimony) by a party in *Doe*, *Karnoski*, or *Stockman*—including third-party discovery—shall be deemed to have been produced in this case, with the following caveat. If Plaintiffs here choose to question a deponent in one of the Related Cases, that deposition will account for one of Plaintiffs' 15 deposition slots. Similarly, if Defendants here choose to question a deponent in one of the Related Cases, other than the named plaintiffs, that deposition will account for one of Defendants' 15 deposition slots.

III. DISPOSITIVE PRETRIAL MOTIONS

If more than one party intends to file a summary judgment motion, the provisions of Local Rule 105.2.c apply.

After motions and responses thereto have been filed, I will advise you if a hearing is to be scheduled.

IV. PRETRIAL CONFERENCES

A pretrial conference and trial date will be set at the Status Hearing.

The pretrial order shall be submitted seven days before the pretrial conference is held. Counsel shall comply with Local Rule 106, as to submission and contents of the pretrial order.

V. COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL RULES AND CM/ECF PROCEDURES

The court will demand compliance with the Local Rules and CM/ECF procedures. If you need to obtain a copy of the Local Rules or the CM/ECF procedures, they are available on our website at www.mdd.uscourts.gov.

VI. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIVACY PROTECTION RULE

Counsel are reminded that the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure were amended, effective December 1, 2007, with the addition of a new Rule 5.2 which has detailed requirements requiring the redaction of filings with this court that contain an individual's social security number, tax payer identification number, or birth date, the name of an individual known to be a minor, or a financial account number. It is essential that counsel comply with this rule and with the revised version of the Judicial Conference Privacy Policy adopted in March 2008. For further information on the Judicial Conference Privacy Policy see: http://www.mdd.uscourts.gov/news/news/privacy_memo.pdf.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: December 27, 2017

/s/
Marvin J. Garbis
United States District Judge