

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
VALDOSTA DIVISION**

WILLIAM WRIGHT,

Plaintiff,

v.

AUTO OWNERS INSURANCE
COMPANY,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CASE NO.: 7:25-CV-00037 (WLS)

ORDER

The Court recently ordered Plaintiff William Wright to respond to Defendant Auto-Owners Insurance Company's Motion for Protective Order. (Doc. 14 at 1.) Wright responded the next day. (Doc. 15.) Yet the Response only registers generalized objection to the Proposed Order, with a single example. This isn't enough for the Court to meaningfully assess the proposed protective order.

So Wright must supplement to address with particularity which provisions in the Proposed Order (Doc. 13) he opposes and why. Does he oppose every provision in the Proposed Order? Or does he only object to some provisions? His Response is unclear. (*See* Doc. 16 at 2.) If he only objects to certain provisions in the Order, he must identify which he opposes, and which he doesn't with particularity—provision-by-provision, if necessary.

Hence Wright is **ORDERED** to supplement his Response to address this issue. He must do so no later than **Monday, August 18, 2025**. Auto Owners's reply, if necessary, is due **no later than seven** days after Wright's response. Once briefing is complete, the Court will determine whether a hearing is necessary.

SO ORDERED, this 13th day of August 2025.

/s/ W. Louis Sands

**W. LOUIS SANDS, SR. JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**