

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF RAMSEY****DISTRICT COURT
SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT**Troy Kenneth Scheffler,
Plaintiff,Court File Number: **62-CV-25-6308**

Case Type: Civil Other/Misc.

Judge: Laura Nelson

vs.

Ramsey County, et al.
Defendants.**Plaintiff's Letter Regarding Discovery
Conference Scheduled 10/14/2025****I. BACKGROUND**

Defendants refused for months to participate in the mandatory Rule 26.06(a) conference, claiming their Answer wasn't "due yet" because they filed a Motion to Dismiss. This is legally incorrect: (1) Rule 26.06(a) uses "initial due date" (July 23, 2025), making the deadline August 22; (2) Rule 26.07 allows courts to stay discovery for "good cause" - its existence proves discovery proceeds unless ordered otherwise, and Defendants never sought such an order; (3) Defendants only moved to dismiss Claims 2 and 3, leaving Claim 1 active and requiring discovery.

Plaintiff extensively met and conferred on September 24-25, explaining why the rules required the conference. Defendants' response: "Our position remains unchanged. We'll discuss again sometime after the court hears our motions." Only when this Court scheduled the discovery conference did they suddenly cooperate. The conference finally occurred October 10th - over 50 days late.

II. CURRENT DISPUTES**A. Interrogatory/Admission Limits**

Defendants propose limiting interrogatories and requests for admission to 25 each. The rules explicitly permit 50 interrogatories. Defendants provided no legal justification or good cause for this limitation.

Given that Defendants have stonewalled for months and ignored the underlying September 2021 data request for nearly five years, Plaintiff should not be handicapped in discovery. The standard is 50 interrogatories and Plaintiff requests that standard amount, plus 50 requests for admission.

B. Sanctions Are Still Appropriate

Defendants only held the Rule 26 conference because they knew this Court scheduled a hearing for tomorrow. That's exactly why sanctions are warranted. If parties can ignore mandatory deadlines for months, then comply at the last minute and say "no harm, no foul," the rules become meaningless. Defendants should not be rewarded for waiting until judicial intervention forced their hand.

The equity problem is stark: When Plaintiff missed the October 1st hearing in good faith due to an emergency, he gracefully accepted accountability. Two of his claims were dismissed. Yet Defendants' months of procedural violations created the very chaos that contributed to that scheduling confusion. They filed three different versions of the same motion (July 14, August 11, September 3), forcing multiple hearing reschedules and creating calendar confusion. Their deficient filings - lacking required meet and confer, missing the § 549.211 disclaimer, filed without proper hearing dates - frustrated the entire proceedings.

Despite this, Plaintiff accepted responsibility for missing the hearing and suffered real consequences. What consequences will Defendants suffer for months of belligerent and indignant conduct? They refused the Rule 26 conference for over 50 days past the deadline. They provided no initial disclosures. They obstructed discovery on an active claim they never even challenged. They ignored a citizen's data request for five years.

If there are no consequences for this conduct, Defendants will continue to ignore rules whenever convenient. They've already demonstrated this pattern: they ignored Plaintiff's data request for five years, refused service waiver, filed defective motions, and now tried to avoid discovery obligations. Only judicial scrutiny produces compliance.

Plaintiff requests: (1) a finding that Defendants' refusal to participate in the Rule 26 conference was willful and in bad faith; (2) costs incurred bringing the Motion to Compel and attending this conference; and (3) a clear message that further violations will result in serious consequences, potentially including waiver of objections to discovery.

Discovery on Claim 1 should have been proceeding for over two months. Defendants are nearly five years late responding to the underlying data request that forms the basis of this claim. The Court should not allow last-minute cooperation to erase accountability for systematic obstruction.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Troy Scheffler

10/13/2025

Troy Scheffler
Plaintiff Pro Se
26359 Shandy Trail, Merrifield, MN 56465
(763) 225-7702 | troyscheffler@gmail.com