

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

NEUROSCIENCE, INC.
and PHARMASAN LABS, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RICHARD T. FORREST and
CERULEAN INVESTMENTS, INCORPORATED,

Defendants.

ORDER

12-cv-813-bbc

In an order dated March 7, 2014, I granted the motion filed by plaintiffs Neuroscience, Inc. and Pharmasan Labs, Inc. to compel the deposition of pro se defendant Richard T. Forrest. Dkt. #87. Now Forrest has filed a document that he calls “motion for ex parte hearing” in which he asks the court for a 90 to 180 day stay of the deposition while he tries to find a new job. Dkt. #91.

I am denying defendant Forrest’s motion for two reasons. First, the motion is not ripe because Forrest says that plaintiffs have not yet contacted him to schedule the deposition. Second, plaintiff has not shown that he is entitled to such a long stay. Although I understand that Forrest wishes to focus his efforts on obtaining employment, I am not persuaded that he will not have any time to sit for a deposition in the near future. Once plaintiffs contact Forrest to schedule the deposition, I anticipate that plaintiffs will work

with Forrest to find a time that will accommodate his other responsibilities.

For reasons that defendant Forrest does not explain, he included much discussion in his motion about issues that have nothing to do with the scheduling of his deposition. Presumably, it is because of those issues that Forrest filed his motion ex parte. At this point, I see no reason why plaintiff's motion or any other document in this case should be hidden from view by the other parties. This includes the transcript of the January 23, 2014 hearing, dkt. #89, Forrest's motion filed on December 16, 2013, dkt. #70, and plaintiffs' motion, affidavit and brief filed on November 27, 2013, dkt. ##45-47. Accordingly, I will give both sides an opportunity to show cause why these documents should not be unsealed.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that

1. Defendant Richard Forrest's "motion for ex parte hearing," dkt. #91, is DENIED.
2. The parties may have until April 8, 2014, to show cause why the documents found at docket nos. 45-47, 70 and 89, should not be unsealed. If the parties do not respond by that date, the clerk of court is directed to unseal those documents.

Entered this 25th day of March, 2014.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge