

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

FRANCOIS P. GIVENS,
Plaintiff,
v.
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-0720-KJN PS


ORDER

On May 25, 2017, plaintiff filed a motion to compel defendants to provide supplemental responses to various requests for production of documents. (ECF No. 63.) For the same reasons outlined in the court’s May 26, 2017 order (see ECF No. 64), and pursuant to Local Rule 251 and the court’s scheduling order, plaintiff’s motion to compel (ECF No. 63) is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE as premature.

All parties are cautioned that they are required to *initiate and exhaust* informal meet-and-confer efforts before requesting an informal telephonic discovery conference or filing a motion to compel. Motions that fail to comply with that requirement will be summarily denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 31, 2017


KENDALL J. NEWMAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE