Thomsen, et al., v. Sacramento Metropolitan Fire District, et al.,

1	
1 2	
2	
3 4	
<del>-</del> 5	
6	
7	
, 8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	MARK THOMSEN,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-09-1108 KJM EFB
12	VS.
13	SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN FIRE DISTRICT; and DOES 1-50,
14	inclusive,
15	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>
16	
17	On February 28, 2012, plaintiff filed a motion to compel further responses to
18	interrogatories and production of documents associated with defendant's Rule 26 disclosures.
19	Dckt. No. 49. The motion was noticed for hearing on March 21, 2012. Id.
20	Local Rule 251(a) requires the parties to a discovery dispute to file a Joint Statement Re
21	Discovery Disagreement at least seven days before the scheduled hearing date, or in this
22	instance, by March 14, 2012. E.D. Cal. L.R. 251(a). The rule further provides that the hearing
23	on the discovery motion may be dropped from calendar without prejudice if the Joint Statement
24	re Discovery Disagreement is not timely filed. Id.
25	////
26	////

1

1	Although the deadline has passed, the docket reveals that no Joint Statement re Discovery
2	Disagreement has been filed in connection with plaintiff's motion to compel further responses to
3	interrogatories and production of documents associated with defendant's Rule 26 disclosures.
4	Therefore, that motion, Dckt. No. 49, is denied without prejudice and the March 21, 2012
5	hearing thereon is vacated.
6	SO ORDERED.
7	DATED: March 15, 2012. EDMUND F. BRENNAN
8	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	
25 26	
26	
	2

I