-JLT Dixon v. Wes	sbrook, et al.	Doc. 30
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STA	TES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	DENISA DIXON,	Case No.: 1:11-cv-01290 AWI JLT
12	Plaintiffs,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR JUDICIAL
13	v.	) NOTICE AND MOTION TO COMPEL ) DEFENDANTS TO COOPERATE IN
14	BPD OFFICERS WESBROOK, et al.,	) DISCOVERY
15	Defendant.	) (Doc. 24)
16	- <del></del>	
17	On March 12, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion for the Court to take judicial notice and a request	
18	that the Court order Defendants to cooperate with discovery efforts related to the identities of certain	
19	bounty hunters. (Doc. 24) Notably, however, Plaintiff fails to identify the material of which she	
20	request judicial notice. Likewise, Plaintiff does not explain why she believes this evidence may be	
21	introduced at this time.	
22	Moreover, though difficult to discern Plaintiff's specific purpose in filing the motion, it	
23	appears that Plaintiff is seeking the Bakersfield Defendants' assistance in identifying and locating the	
24	bounty hunters she claims improperly entered her home on January 6, 2011. (Doc. 24 at 1) However,	
25	Plaintiff is advised that, according to Fed. Rule Civ. P. 26(d), discovery may not begin until after the	
26	parties have completed the conference required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f). This conference must occur	
27	27	
28		
		1

1	at least 21 days before the scheduling conference which, in this case, is May 16, 2012. (Doc. 19)	
2	Moreover, Plaintiff is advised that the initial disclosures that are required to be made under Fed. R.	
3	Civ. P. 26(a) are not required to be made until "at or within 14 days after the parties' Rule 26(f)	
4	conference." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(C).	
5	Therefore, the motion for judicial notice and to compel Defendants to cooperate with	
6	discovery is <b>DENIED</b> .	
7		
8	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
9	Dated: March 19, 2012 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston	
10	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27	<sup>1</sup> In light of the pending motion to dismiss, whether the scheduling conference will go forward on May 21, 2012,	

In light of the pending motion to dismiss, whether the scheduling conference will go forward on May 21, 2012, will depend upon whether the complaint withstands dismissal or, if it does not, whether there is an operative pleading on file by that time.