

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

**MARY K. BARTLETT,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**CITY OF ARKANSAS CITY, KANSAS,**

**Defendant.**

**Case No. 10-4064-EFM**

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the court on defendant's motion for a protective order. (Doc. 37). No response in opposition has been filed; therefore, this motion is uncontested and granted pursuant to D. Kan. Rule 7.4. Equally important, the deposition notices require document production of a party in violation of the 30-day period set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(2) and 34(b)(2)(A). Moreover, Request Nos. 1, 2, and 4 are overly broad and oppressive because they contain no temporal limitation. Request No. 3 is also rejected as an attempt to invade the mental impressions, conclusions, and opinions of defense counsel. Finally, one of the persons to be deposed, Steve Archer, no longer works for the City and defendant has no control over documents that might be in Archer's possession. Any documents sought from Mr. Archer must be compelled via a subpoena.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that defendant's motion for a protective order **(Doc. 37)** is **GRANTED**. The production requests in the deposition notices are quashed.

Dated at Wichita, Kansas this 30<sup>th</sup> day of March 2011.

S/ Karen M. Humphreys

---

KAREN M. HUMPHREYS  
United States Magistrate Judge