

RECEIVED
USDC, WESTERN DISTRICT OF LA
TONY R. MOORE, CLERK
DATE 12/10/14
113

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
LAFAYETTE DIVISION

LOUISIANA CRAWFISH PRODUCERS
ASSOCIATION - WEST, et al.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:10-1085
(LEAD)

-vs-

JUDGE DRELL

MALLARD BASIN, INC., et al.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE HANNA

****consolidated with****

LOUISIANA CRAWFISH PRODUCERS
ASSOCIATION - WEST, et al.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:11-0461
(MEMBER)

-vs-

JUDGE DRELL

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, et al.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE HANNA

RULING ON APPEAL

The present Appeal from a Ruling by Magistrate Judge Hanna (Doc. No. 168) continues a pattern seen in the Docket Sheet of skipping around the edges of the discovery issue. We explain:

First and foremost, the Ruling is well reasoned and is absolutely correct. Discovery is allowed in NEPA cases. Yet what discovery is actually appropriate remains somewhat vague (save the proposed deposition of Michael Hermann). As the parties have framed the issue so far in the briefs, Plaintiffs want discovery - Defendants say NO!

Accordingly, aside from the specific discovery already allowed by Magistrate Judge Hanna's Ruling, we set the following requirements to satisfy

the several burdens on the taking of discovery in this case. Going forward, all proposed specific discovery requests not agreed to by Defendants shall first be presented to the Magistrate Judge with a request and justification for the allowance of the discovery. Defendants shall have ten (10) days to file objections and their justification for not allowing the discovery. The Magistrate Judge shall rule due course.

Aside from this procedural clarification, the Appeal is DENIED AND DISMISSED.

SIGNED on this 10th day of December, 2014 at Alexandria, Louisiana.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dee D. Drell", written over a horizontal line.

DEE D. DRELL, CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT