

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MATTHEW JENNINGS,)	2:08-cv-01305-HDM-RAM
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	ORDER
vs.)	
)	
A. MORELAND, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

The plaintiff has filed objections to the magistrate judge's order denying his motions to compel and for sanctions (#64). At a hearing on February 19, 2010, defense counsel admitted that discovery deadlines have not been met. In response, the magistrate judge ordered that defense counsel conduct a telephonic conference with plaintiff by March 5, 2010, during which the parties should attempt to resolve as many of the issues identified in plaintiff's motion to compel as possible. The magistrate judge further ordered that on or before March 12, 2010, defense counsel file with the

1 court a notice identifying the discovery disputes that remain. A
2 hearing was set for March 19, 2010, during which the magistrate
3 judge would resolve the remaining discovery disputes. In light of
4 these orders, the magistrate judge denied plaintiff's motion to
5 compel and his motion for sanctions.

6 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), a magistrate judge may
7 issue an order regarding any motion that is not dispositive of the
8 case. This court may reconsider a magistrate judge's order
9 regarding a pretrial matter where "it has been shown that the
10 magistrate judge's ruling is clearly erroneous or contrary to law."
11 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a).

12 The magistrate judge's order denying plaintiff's motions to
13 compel and for sanctions was not clearly erroneous or contrary to
14 the law, particularly in view of the fact that the discovery
15 disputes are still in the process of being resolved. Accordingly,
16 plaintiff's objection to the magistrate judge's order (#64) is
17 hereby **DENIED**.

18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19 DATED: This 1st day of March, 2010.

20 
21 _____
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

23
24
25
26
27
28