

1:20-cv-44, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection v. Citizens Bank, N.A., 3/16/2023

Plaintiff moves under Rule 26(c) for a protective order preventing Defendant from deposing three of its employees. The depositions were properly noticed by Defendant pursuant to Rule 30 and prior to the close of fact discovery. As the movant, Plaintiff bears the burden of showing that "good cause" exists for the issuance of a protective order necessary to protect it from "annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense." Plaintiff has failed to meet that burden here as to these three fact depositions. Overall, Plaintiff's arguments generally strike the Court as unreasonable attempts to micromanage and restrict its adversary's discovery strategy and defense preparation. Plaintiff has simply not made a sufficient showing of "undue burden or expense" as to any of the three depositions or that allowing them to proceed would subject anyone to "annoyance, embarrassment, or oppression." Finally, Plaintiff's counsel may deal with any specific, objectionable questions posed by objecting as allowed under Rule 30(c)(2).

So Ordered by Magistrate Judge Lincoln D. Almond on 3/16/2023.

(Saucier, Martha) (Entered: 03/16/2023)