

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
ORLANDO DIVISION**

**TRANSAMERICA LIFE INSURANCE
COMPANY,**

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 6:23-cv-452-ACC-DCI

**LAWRENCE E. WHITE and
PARTNERSHIP MANAGEMENT
SERVICES GROUP, LLC,**

Defendants.

ORDER

This cause comes before the Court for consideration following a hearing on the following motions:

MOTION: Motion to Compel Defendant White's Responses to Requests for Production (Doc. 62)

FILED: October 12, 2023

MOTION: Motion to Compel Defendant White's Interrogatory Responses (Doc. 63)

FILED: October 12, 2023

MOTION: Motion to Compel Defendant PMSG's Responses to Requests for Production (Doc. 64)

FILED: October 12, 2023

THEREON it is ORDERED that the motions are GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.

On October 12, 2023, Plaintiff filed three motions to compel. Docs. 62, 63, 64 (the Motions). Defendant filed timely responses in opposition. Docs. 70, 71, 72. On November 13, 2023, the Court held a hearing on the Motions.

As stated at the hearing, boilerplate objections are meaningless, meritless, and due to be overruled. *See, e.g., Asphalt Paving Sys., Inc. v. General Combustion Corp.*, No. 6:15-cv-49-Orl-41TBS, 2016 WL 3167712, at *2 (M.D. Fla. June 7, 2016) (“The Court does not consider frivolous, conclusory, general, or boilerplate objections.”); *Siddiq v. Saudi Arabian Airlines Corp.*, No. 6:11-cv-69-Orl-19GJK, 2011 WL 6936485, at *3 (M.D. Fla. Dec. 7, 2011) (“Objections which state that a discovery request is ‘vague, overly broad, or unduly burdensome’ are, by themselves, meaningless, and are deemed without merit by this Court.” (citations omitted); Middle District Discovery (2021) at 15 (“Objections to requests for production should be specific, not generalized . . . Boilerplate objections such as ‘the request is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and outside the scope of permissible discovery’ are insufficient without a full, fair explanation particular to the facts of the case.”).

For the reasons stated at the hearing, it is **ORDERED** that:

1. Motion to Compel Defendant White’s Responses to Requests for Production (Doc. 62) is **GRANTED in part** such that,
 - a. Defendant White’s objections to Request for Production (RFP) 1-24 are overruled; and
 - b. **on or before November 27, 2023**, Defendant White is compelled to provide to Plaintiff full responses to RFPs 1-24. As to each request, Defendant White must provide responsive documents, identify documents already provided, or state clearly that Defendant White has no responsive documents; and

2. Motion to Compel Defendant White's Interrogatory Responses (Doc. 63) is **GRANTED in part** such that,

- a. Defendant White's objections to Interrogatories 1-2, 4, and 6-15 are overruled;
- b. Defendant White's objection to Interrogatory 16 is sustained; and
- c. **on or before November 27, 2023**, Defendant White is compelled to provide Plaintiff complete answers to Interrogatories 1-2, 4, and 6-15; and

3. Motion to Compel Defendant PMSG's Responses to Requests for Production (Doc. 64) is **GRANTED in part** such that,

- a. Defendant PMSG's objections RFPs 1-15, 17-19, 21-22, and 25-27 are overruled, except that:
 - i. the last sentence of the objection to RFP 12 is sustained and the term "other circumstances" is stricken from the Request;
 - ii. the last sentence of the objection to RFP 17 is sustained; and
 - iii. the third sentence of objections to RFP 18 and 19 are sustained and the term "participation" is stricken from the Request; and
- b. **on or before November 27, 2023**, Defendant Partnership Management Services Group, LLC (PMSG) is compelled to provide Plaintiff full responses to RFPs 1-15, 17-19, 21-22, and 25-27 in compliance with the Court's rulings at the hearing. As to each request, Defendant PMSG must provide responsive documents, identify documents already provided, or state clearly that Defendant White has no responsive documents; and

4. the Motions (Docs. 62, 63, 64) are **DENIED** in all other respects.

ORDERED in Orlando, Florida on November 13, 2023.



DANIEL C. IRICK
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE