Robert L. Stepans
Ryan R. Shaffer
James C. Murnion
Victoria K.M. Gannon
Meyer, Shaffer & Stepans, PLLP
430 Ryman Street
Missoula, MT 59802
Tel: (406) 543-6929
Fax: (406) 721-1799
rob@mss-lawfirm.com
ryan@mss-lawfirm.com
james@mss-lawfirm.com
katy@mss-lawfirm.com

Matthew L. Merrill (appearing *pro hac vice*) Merrill Law, LLC 6631 Mariposa Court Denver, CO 80221 Tel: (303) 947-4453 matthew@merrillwaterlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA BILLINGS DIVISION

TRACY CAEKAERT, and CAMILLIA MAPLEY,) Case No. CV-20-52-BLG-SPW
Plaintiffs, vs.)) PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR) PROTECTIVE ORDER RE: WTPA'S FOURTH
WATCHTOWER BIBLE AND TRACT SOCIETY OF NEW YORK, INC., and WATCH TOWER BIBLE AND TRACT SOCIETY OF PENNSYLVANIA.,	DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO PLAINITFFS)
Defendants,)) _)

Plaintiffs Tracy Caekaert and Camillia Mapley, by and through undersigned counsel, move pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 26(c) for a protective order forbidding Defendant Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania ("WTPA") from

conducting discovery into the matters sought in its Fourth Discovery Requests, including: (1) discovery into briefing filed at the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals; and (2) discovery into the prefiling investigation conducted by Plaintiffs' lawyers.

A Brief in Support of this Motion is being filed contemporaneously herewith, along with a complete copy of WTPA's Fourth Discovery Requests.

CERTIFICATION OF CONFERRAL EFFORTS

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 26(c) and L.R. 26.3(c)(1) the undersigned certifies that extensive efforts were made to resolve the discovery disputes at issue in this Motion, but were unsuccessful:

- ➤ On Friday, August 18th, counsel for the parties held a phone conference where Plaintiffs counsel detailed their concerns with WTPA's discovery and requested that the discovery requests be modified. WTPA's counsel stated that it believed the discovery was proper and would not agree to modify them.
- ➤ Plaintiffs' counsel followed up the August 18th phone call with detailed written correspondence, including examples of modifications to the discovery that would eliminate Plaintiffs' concerns and permit substantive answers.
- ➤ On August 31, 2023, WTPA agreed to modify its requests for production but would not agree to any modification of the interrogatories.

Case 1:20-cv-00052-SPW Document 261 Filed 09/08/23 Page 3 of 4

➤ Because WTPA's Requests for Production are still tied directly to the

disputed Interrogatories disputes over all of the discovery requests remained

unresolved.

> Thereafter, counsel for both parties remained engaged through phone calls

and email correspondence to try and resolve Plaintiffs' concerns with the

discovery requests but were unable to make additional progress on

resolution.

DATED this 8th day of September, 2023.

By: /s/ Ryan Shaffer

Ryan R. Shaffer

MEYER, SHAFFER & STEPANS PLLP

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Local Rule 1.4, this document has been served on all parties via electronic service through the Court's Case Management/Electronic Case Filing (CM/ECF) system.

By: <u>/s/ Ryan Shaffer</u>
Ryan R. Shaffer
MEYER, SHAFFER & STEPANS PLLP

Attorneys for Plaintiffs