

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

JAMES JOSHUA MAYFIELD, JAMES  
ALLISON MAYFIELD, JR. TERRY  
MAYFIELD,

Plaintiffs,

v.

IVAN OROZCO, SCOTT JONES, JAMES  
LEWIS, RICK PATTISON, COUNTY OF  
SACRAMENTO, UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA HEALTH SYSTEM, DR.  
GREGORY SOKOLOV, DR. CHARLES  
SCOTT, DR. ROBERT HALES, DOES 1-  
5,

Defendants.

No. 2:13-cv-02499 JAM AC

ORDER

Plaintiffs have filed a Motion to Compel Production of Documents and Responses to Interrogatories from defendants Scott Jones, James Lewis, Rick Pattison and the County of Sacramento. ECF No. 76. Defendants University of California Davis Health System, Sokolov and Haleshave, in turn, filed a Motion to Compel Production of Documents and Responses to Interrogatories from plaintiff James J. Mayfield. ECF 75. Both parties have filed numerous documents in support of and opposition to the Motions. ECF Nos 86-94, 96. Among those documents is a Joint Statement of the parties regarding the dispute. ECF No. 87. This discovery matter was referred to the undersigned by E.D. Cal. R. (“Local Rule”) 302(c)(1).

1 The parties, all of whom are represented by counsel, have not complied with this court's  
2 standard instructions regarding discovery disputes, see  
3 [www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/judges/all-judges/united-states-magistrate-judge-](http://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/judges/all-judges/united-states-magistrate-judge-allison-claire-ac)  
4 [allison-claire-ac](http://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/judges/all-judges/united-states-magistrate-judge-allison-claire-ac) ("Standard Information"), nor with this court's Local Rules governing discovery  
5 disputes, see E.D. Cal. R. 251 (discovery matters), nor with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure  
6 governing requests for protective orders, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1).

7 The parties' filings indicate they are aware of Local Rule 251 but have either failed to  
8 understand it or made a conscious decision to ignore it. Counsel are reminded of their obligation  
9 to familiarize themselves with, and to comply with, the applicable Federal Rules of Civil  
10 Procedure, this court's Local Rules governing discovery matters, and the undersigned's standard  
11 instructions regarding discovery disputes.

12 In this instance, the Court will go no further than to remove the pending matters from its  
13 June 8, 2016 calendar without prejudice to their renotice at a proper time and in proper form. The  
14 parties and their counsel are cautioned however, that going forward, they face sanctions for the  
15 filing of, or response to, any discovery motion that fails to comply with the applicable rules and  
16 instructions.

17 1. Joint Statement

18 The moving party is required to "draft and file a document entitled 'Joint Statement re  
19 Discovery Disagreement,'" which is to be prepared with, and signed by, all parties who are  
20 concerned with the discovery motion. Local Rule 251(c). Other than the very brief notice of  
21 motion to be filed by the movant, this Joint Statement is the *only* document that should be filed in  
22 regard to any renewed discovery motion. "All arguments and briefing that would otherwise be  
23 included in a memorandum of points and authorities supporting or opposing the motion shall be  
24 included in this joint statement, and no separate briefing shall be filed." Local Rule 251(c).

25 The parties are advised that the undersigned will not consider any declarations,  
26 memoranda or other documents (including any already filed on the docket), that are not included  
27 in or attached as exhibits to the Joint Statement. Moreover, any party filing other documents in  
28 support of or in response to the discovery motion – outside of the Joint Statement – will be

1 subject to sanctions. See also, Local Rule 251(d) (failure to meet or obtain Joint Statement). The  
2 parties are also reminded that courtesy copies of all Joint Statements, with declarations, exhibits  
3 and other attachments tabbed, are mandatory and should be delivered to the Clerk of Court at  
4 least seven (7) days before a scheduled hearing. See Standard Information at 2.

5 2. Meet and Confer

6 The parties must meet and confer in an attempt to resolve their differences. E.D. Cal. R.  
7 251(b). Any renewed motion “must include a certification that the movant has in good faith  
8 conferred or attempted to confer with other affected parties in an effort to resolve the dispute  
9 without court action.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1) (emphasis added).

10 The parties are advised that the undersigned strictly enforces meet and confer  
11 requirements. Written correspondence between the parties, including email, is insufficient to  
12 satisfy the parties’ meet and confer obligations under Local Rule 251(b). Prior to the filing of a  
13 Joint Statement, the parties must confer in person or via telephone or video conferencing in an  
14 attempt to resolve the dispute. See [www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/judges/all-](http://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/judges/all-judges/united-states-magistrate-judge-allison-claire-ac)  
15 [judges/united-states-magistrate-judge-allison-claire-ac](http://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/judges/all-judges/united-states-magistrate-judge-allison-claire-ac).

16 3. Notice of Motion


17 If the parties renew their motions, they are reminded that hearings scheduled before the  
18 undersigned should be scheduled for Courtroom 26, on the Eighth Floor of the federal courthouse  
19 at 501 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

20 For the reasons stated above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that

21 1. The June 8, 2016 hearing on the Motions to Compel Discovery Responses filed by  
22 both parties is VACATED; and

23 2. The Chase defendants’ motion to quash and for a protective order (ECF No. 33) is  
24 DENIED without prejudice to its renewal in proper form.

25 DATED: June 3, 2016

26   
27 ALLISON CLAIRE  
28 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE