

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____	)	
M.G.U., <u>et al.</u> ,	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 18-1458 (PLF)
	)	
KIRSTJEN NIELSEN, <u>et al.</u> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' Emergency Motion for Expedited Discovery [Dkt. No. 25] in advance of the July 12, 2018 hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for a Preliminary Injunction and Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order. Upon careful consideration of the parties' written submissions, the relevant legal authorities, and the entire record in this case, the Court will grant plaintiffs' motion in part and deny it in part.<sup>1</sup>

With respect to the parties' legal arguments, the Court finds persuasive the reasoning of Judge John D. Bates in Guttenberg v. Emery, 26 F. Supp. 3d 88 (D.D.C. 2014). The reasonableness standard is the more appropriate standard for assessing motions for expedited discovery, particularly in cases where the expedited discovery is related to a motion for a

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court has reviewed the following documents in connection with the pending motion: Complaint [Dkt. No. 1]; Plaintiffs' Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order [Dkt. No. 8]; Plaintiffs' Motion for a Preliminary Injunction [Dkt. No. 13]; Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order [Dkt. No. 16]; Plaintiffs' Emergency Motion for Expedited Discovery [Dkt. No. 25]; Joint Status Report [Dkt. No. 26]; Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for a Preliminary Injunction [Dkt. No. 27]; Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Emergency Motion for Expedited Discovery [Dkt. No. 28]; and Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Their Emergency Motion for Expedited Discovery [Dkt. No. 29].

preliminary injunction. See id. at 97-98. Applying the reasonableness standard here, and in view of the particular circumstances of this case, it is hereby

ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Emergency Motion for Expedited Discovery [Dkt. No. 25] is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that defendants shall respond to the following discovery requests listed in Plaintiffs' Expedited Discovery Requests to Defendants [Dkt. No. 25-2], on or before 12:00 p.m. on July 11, 2018: Interrogatory No. 1, Interrogatory No. 2, Interrogatory No. 5, Interrogatory No. 6, Request for Production No. 1, Request for Production No. 4, Request for Admission No. 1, Request for Admission No. 2, and Request for Admission No. 5; it is

FURTHER ORDERED that defendants shall be prepared to address the following discovery requests listed in Plaintiffs' Expedited Discovery Requests to Defendants [Dkt. No. 25-2], at the hearing on July 12, 2018: Interrogatory No. 3, Interrogatory No. 4, Request for Production No. 2, Request for Production No. 3, Request for Admission No. 3, Request for Admission No. 4, Request for Admission No. 6, Request for Admission No. 7, Request for Admission No. 8, Request for Admission No. 9, and Request for Admission No. 10; and it is

FURTHER ORDERED that defendants shall be prepared to address the following questions at the hearing on July 12, 2018: (i) whether the adult plaintiffs are presently detained; and (ii) whether the adult plaintiffs have passed a credible fear interview in connection with their asylum applications, and if not, whether such an interview has been scheduled.

SO ORDERED.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
PAUL L. FRIEDMAN  
United States District Judge

DATE: July 9, 2018