

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
CENTRAL DIVISION**

JASON LYNCH,	)	No. 4:24-cv-00740-LPR-BBM
PLAINTIFF	)	
v.	)	
DOES 2-3, CAPT. CLAYNTON EDWARDS,	)	
LT. ROSS,	)	
SGT. SWINDLE, SGT. WORKMAN, SGT.	)	
ROGERS,	)	
CO. WOOD, SGT. SCILER, CO. GOODWIN,	)	
ASHLEY WATTS, KATYNN SMITH,	)	
TURNKEY, DOE 1	)	
DEFENDANTS	)	

**PLAINTIFF’S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF HIS POSITION REGARDING TK HEALTH’S
DISCOVERY RESPONSES**

Plaintiff Jason Lynch respectfully submits this reply in support of his position that Defendant TK Health’s discovery responses are incomplete, evasive, and insufficient to identify the Doe defendants and the medical personnel involved in Plaintiff’s care.

I. TK Health’s responses are overinclusive and do not meaningfully answer the requests

TK Health has provided Plaintiff with a broad list of names, records, and Bates ranges, including repeated names and individuals who appear to have no direct involvement in Plaintiff’s claims. Plaintiff specifically requested the identities of the medical personnel and jail personnel who had direct interaction with him, including pill-call personnel, medical staff, and jail staff involved in his care, medication, grievances, and related events.

Instead of providing a clear, targeted identification of the relevant individuals, TK Health has produced a shotgun list of more than 200 names, including repeated names and people with the same last name, making it extremely difficult for Plaintiff to determine which person is the actual Doe defendant or which person was actually involved in the events at issue.

That approach does not fairly answer the requests. Discovery responses should be useful, not

confusing. TK Health should be required to identify, as specifically as possible, the individuals who had direct interaction with Plaintiff during the relevant time period and to distinguish between similarly named employees in a way that allows Plaintiff to identify the correct persons.

II. TK Health cannot satisfy its discovery obligations by dumping records on Plaintiff

TK Health's production of large volumes of medical records and staffing records, without clear identification of the relevant people, shifts the burden of identifying the Doe defendants from TK Health to Plaintiff. That is especially improper where TK Health has already indicated that it knows, or can narrow, the possible identities of some personnel.

Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d), a responding party may rely on business records only if it specifies the records with sufficient detail to enable the requesting party to locate and identify them as readily as the responding party could. A party may not simply direct the requesting party to an undifferentiated mass of records.

Here, TK Health's response does exactly that: it points Plaintiff to a large stack of records and a long list of names, but it does not clearly identify who actually interacted with Plaintiff at pill call, who responded to his medical communications, or who was "Nurse F." That is not a complete answer.

III. TK Health did not clearly answer who "Nurse F" was

Plaintiff specifically requested the identity of "Nurse F" in connection with his medical communications and medical requests. TK Health did not clearly and definitively answer that question.

Instead, TK Health's response was equivocal. It suggested that "F. Nurse" likely referred to the "Float Nurse" on shift and then listed several possible names, including:

- * Savannah Henderson, LPN for the June 11, 2024 request; and
- * for the July 6, 2024 request, possibly Heather Jones, LPN, Katlyn Ladd, LPN, or Ashley Watt, LPN.

That is not a clear identification. If TK Health knows enough to narrow the possibilities to particular nurses and dates, it should be required to state which person was actually “Nurse F” for each relevant medical communication or request. A list of possibilities is not a real answer.

IV. TK Health’s response frustrates the purpose of limited discovery

This Court authorized limited discovery to help identify Doe defendants and address exhaustion issues. TK Health’s responses frustrate that purpose by making Plaintiff sift through a large number of names, including repeated names and similarly named employees, rather than providing direct identification of the people who actually interacted with him.

The relevant inquiry is not whether TK Health can produce many names. The issue is whether TK Health can identify the specific individuals involved in Plaintiff’s pill call, medical complaints, medical requests, and related interactions. Plaintiff’s requests were tailored to that purpose, and TK Health should be compelled to provide a clearer, more focused response.

V. Requested relief

Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court order TK Health to:

- a. Supplement its responses and identify, with specificity, the medical personnel and jail personnel who had direct interaction with Plaintiff during the relevant time period;
- b. Eliminate confusion caused by repeated and duplicative names by identifying the correct individual where more than one employee shares the same or similar name;
- c. Clearly identify who was “Nurse F” for each relevant medical communication and request;
- d. Provide a sworn supplemental response stating, to the extent known, the full name and role of each person involved in Plaintiff’s pill call, medical complaints, and medical requests; and

- e. Grant any further relief the Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,
JASON LYNCH
Plaintiff, Pro Se

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jason H. Lynch". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial "J" and a prominent "H".