

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TALLAHASSEE DIVISION**

GREENLIGHT CAPITAL, INC.,

Plaintiff/Judgment Creditor,

v.

Case No. 4:25-MC-031-MW-MAF

JAMES FISHBACK,

Defendant/Judgment Debtor,

_____ /

ORDER

Plaintiff has filed another motion to compel, ECF No. 90, asserting that Defendant Fishback did not “fully comply” with the Orders of this Court. In particular, Plaintiff focused on four specific subjects of “noncompliance.” *Id.* at 4. Plaintiff states that it does so “in the interest of efficiency,” but simultaneously asserting that it “does not waive, and expressly reserves, all rights to challenge and seek relief for additional deficiencies in Fishback’s compliance with the Court’s Orders” *Id.*

The motion to compel appears to be focused on expediency rather than efficiency. It appears that Plaintiff is content to keep returning to this

Court and filing additional motions to compel to obtain discovery or property from the Defendant. That is not the most efficient process for the Court, but it perhaps simplifies things. Accordingly, Defendant Fishback has until **June 18, 2026**, to file a response to the instant motion to compel, ECF No. 90. Defendant must address the four items listed: (1) the Cartier watch and the June 2025 purchase from Bucherer in the amount of \$7,473.00; (2) the 2023 Tesla Model 3; (3) Defendant's R.J. O'Brien account; and (4) Defendant's Bank of America account. *Id.* at 4-7.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

1. Ruling on Plaintiff's motion to compel, ECF No. 90, is **DEFERRED**.
2. Defendant Fishback must file a response to the motion to compel, ECF No. 90, on or before **June 18, 2026**.

DONE AND ORDERED on June 8, 2026.

S/ Martin A. Fitzpatrick
MARTIN A. FITZPATRICK
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE