## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TAMPA DIVISION

TYNTEC INC., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CASE NO. 8:17-cv-591-T-26MAP

SYNIVERSE TECHNOLOGIES, LLC,

Defendant.

## <u>O R D E R</u>

**PENDING BEFORE THE COURT** for resolution is the Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Production of Documents to which Defendant has filed a Memorandum of Law in Opposition.<sup>1</sup> The Court has carefully considered the submissions of the parties, including the supporting declarations of Mr. Medlock and Mr. Cash.<sup>2</sup> The Court has also reviewed the procedural history of this case, including the temporal allegation of Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint and the Court's specific finding following the two-day hearing on Plaintiffs' first motion for temporary injunctive relief that this was "not a close case" with regard to Plaintiffs substantial likelihood of prevailing on the merits, a finding the Court relied on in denying Plaintiffs' second motion for temporary injunctive relief.<sup>3</sup> Taking all of these factors into consideration, it is **ORDERED** 

<sup>1</sup> See dockets 91 and 95.

 $^2$  See dockets 93 and 95-1-7.

<sup>3</sup> <u>See</u> dockets 42, 83 at page 174, and 85.

**AND ADJUDGED** that Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel Production of Documents (Dkt. 91) is **denied** subject to the following conditions.

First, Plaintiffs are directed to respond to Defendant's proposed search terms no later than **December 11, 2017**. Second, the parties shall substantially complete discovery through the production of documents and answers to interrogatories no later than **March 1, 2018**. Finally, recognizing that the temporal scope of discovery should be proportional to the needs of the case,<sup>4</sup> the Court directs that the temporal scope of discovery with regard to Plaintiffs' pending document requests shall be the time frames suggested by Defendant in the October 30, 2017, and November 6, 2017, e-mails from Mr. Cash to Mr. Medlock.<sup>5</sup>

DONE AND ORDERED at Tampa, Florida, on December 4, 2017.

s/Richard A. Lazzara RICHARD A. LAZZARA UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

<u>COPIES FURNISHED TO</u>: Counsel of Record

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> <u>See</u> Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(1).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> <u>See</u> dockets 93-2 and 95-7.