

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – FRESNO DIVISION

CARL L. JIMENA,

Plaintiff,

v.

UBS AG BANK, INC., SWITZERLAND
HEADQUARTERS, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:07-cv-00367-OWW-SKO

**ORDER REGARDING DISCOVERY
DISPUTE SET FOR HEARING ON
SEPTEMBER 17, 2010**

On August 20, 2010, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel further discovery responses from UBS. (Doc. 258.) During the course of presenting the most recent discovery dispute to the Court (Docs. 211, 212), the parties did not file the Joint Statement re Discovery Disagreement ("Joint Statement") required by Rule 251 of the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. Instead, they each filed a separate statement regarding their respective positions as to the discovery dispute. (*See* Docs. 246, 248, 250, 255.) While the Court previously accommodated the parties' inability to complete a Joint Statement, the Court finds it necessary that, for purposes of the current discovery dispute (*see* Doc. 258), the parties file a Joint Statement.

The Joint Statement shall be limited to 30 pages. The Joint Statement must also methodically set forth (1) the disputed discovery request, (2) the response received, (3) the propounding party's argument why the response is inadequate, and (4) the responding party's

1 argument why the response is adequate or why further response is not required. This process should
2 be repeated for each individual discovery request disputed. *See* L.R. 251.

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 27, 2010

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE