

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

JOHN MARTIN,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
SYSCO CORPORATION, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 1:16-cv-00990-DAD-SAB  
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION  
TO COMPEL FURTHER RESPONSES  
FROM DEFENDANT SYSCO CENTRAL  
CALIFORNIA, INC. AND MOTION TO  
COMPEL RESPONSES FROM  
DEFENDANT SYSCO CORPORATION  
FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH RULE  
251  
(ECF Nos. 28, 29)

Plaintiff filed a motion to compel Defendant Sysco Central California, Inc. to provide further responses to Plaintiff’s request for production of documents and a motion to compel Defendant Sysco Corporation to respond to Plaintiff’s interrogatories and demand for production of documents on November 1, 2017. (ECF No. 28, 29.) On November 3, 2017, an order was filed consolidating the two motions for a hearing on November 22, 2017. (ECF No. 31.) In the November 3, 2017 order, the parties were ordered to comply with Rule 251 of the Local Rules of the Eastern District of California, and to file a joint statement of discovery disagreement on or before November 15, 2017. (*Id.*) The parties were advised that failure to file a joint statement as required by the order would result in the denial of the motion and the Court will not find good cause to extend the discovery deadlines based on the failure to comply with Rule 251 or the

