

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
ORLANDO DIVISION

CARLOS BONILLA and CLARIBEL  
FIGUEROA,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No: 6:23-cv-2289-JSS-LHP

SCOTTSDALE INSURANCE  
COMPANY,

Defendant

---

**SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEFING ORDER**

This cause comes before the Court on review of Plaintiffs' Motion for Protective Order Regarding Defendant's Requested Fifth Inspection of the Subject Property (Doc. No. 27) and Defendant's Response in Opposition (Doc. No. 28). Upon review, the Court finds supplemental briefing from the parties appropriate. See Doc. No. 18 ¶ 6.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that on or before **April 5, 2024**, the parties shall each file a supplemental brief, not to exceed **five (5) pages** in length, addressing, with citation to applicable legal authority,<sup>1</sup> the following:

---

<sup>1</sup> General citations to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26 or 34, or general legal

1. The relevancy of a fifth inspection by a professional engineer, who, according to Defendant, would be the first engineer to conduct an inspection of the subject property.
2. Whether inspections conducted prior to commencement of this lawsuit have any impact on the analysis of whether another inspection should be permitted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34.
3. At what point the number of inspections, under relevant law, becomes duplicative, or causes annoyance/harassment, or would be unduly burdensome under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26.
4. Any other issue the parties deem relevant to resolution of Plaintiffs' Motion (Doc. No. 27).

**DONE** and **ORDERED** in Orlando, Florida on March 26, 2024.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LESLIE HOFFMAN PRICE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Copies furnished to:

Counsel of Record  
Unrepresented Parties

\_\_\_\_\_  
principles concerning the scope of discovery, will not alone suffice.