

1 discovery requests. Plaintiff responds that the discovery requests were the “succinct description
2 of the materials sought through discovery.”

3 The Court has reviewed the discovery requests propounded to Plaintiff and they do not
4 comply with the order to provide Plaintiff with a “succinct description of the materials sought
5 through discovery.” On October 15, 2015, Plaintiff served a fourth request for interrogatories
6 containing one interrogatory which stated:

7 For each of YOUR responses to Plaintiff’s Third Set of Requests for Admissions
(Nos. 13-25) that is not an unqualified admission:

- 8 (1) state the number of the request;
9 (2) state all facts upon which YOU base YOUR response;
10 (3) state the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of all PERSONS who have
knowledge of those facts; and
11 (4) identify all DOCUMENTS and other tangible things that support YOUR
response and state the name, address, and telephone number of the PERSON who
has each DOCUMENT or thing.

12 (ECF No. 75-2.) Plaintiff also served a fifth request for production of documents which stated,
13 “If YOUR response to any of Plaintiffs Third Set of Requests for Admissions (Nos. 13- 25) is
14 not an unqualified admission produce all documents supporting your response and/or denial.”

15 (ECF No. 75-2.) Finally, Plaintiff served a third request for admission setting forth thirteen
16 requests for admissions. (ECF No. 75-2.) In her response, Plaintiff contends that this request for
17 admissions is the “succinct description of the materials sought through discovery.” (Pl.’s
18 Response to the Court’s Nov. 2, 2015 Order 3, ECF No. 77.) The Court finds that a request for
19 admissions is not a “succinct description of the materials sought through discovery.”

20 Since Plaintiff served new requests for discovery, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil
21 Procedure, Defendant has thirty days to respond and the October 8, 2015 order is moot.
22 Accordingly, the Court denies Plaintiff’s motion for an extension of time to request an informal
23 telephonic conference as the responses to the discovery request are not yet due.

24 In the November 4, 2015 response, Plaintiff requests an order on her motion to compel.
25 However, there is no motion to compel currently pending before the Court. Most recently the
26 parties requested an informal discovery dispute conference and the Court found that it was
27 unable to resolve the dispute without a more succinct description of the materials sought by
28 Plaintiff. (ECF No. 73.) At this time, all the discovery disputes that have been brought before

1 the Court have been addressed.

2 If the parties are unable to resolve the remaining issues, a motion to compel can be filed
3 after the date by which the discovery responses are due. In the event that a motion to compel
4 becomes necessary, the parties shall contact the courtroom deputy to determine a date by which
5 the Court and parties are available. The parties shall set the motion to compel for hearing on that
6 date and will be required to appear at 8:00 a.m. and should plan to spend the day meeting and
7 conferring until they are able to resolve the dispute. During the course of the meet and confer,
8 the Court will periodically check in on the parties' progress in resolving the outstanding issues.

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's application for an order
10 modifying the October 8, 2015 order is DENIED.

11
12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: November 6, 2015


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28