

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

JENNIFER HUGUNIN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ROCKLIN UNIFIED SCHOOL  
DISTRICT, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:15-cv-00939 MCE AC (TEMP)

ORDER

On January 26, 2016, defendants filed a motion to compel and noticed that motion for hearing before the undersigned on February 24, 2016, pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(1). The undersigned’s standing order explains that Local Rule 251(a) “requires the parties to file a Joint Statement re Discovery Disagreement,”<sup>1</sup> that the undersigned “strictly enforces the deadline for filing Joint Statements,” and that “[a]ny motion will be removed from calendar if the Joint Statement is not filed at least seven (7) days before the scheduled hearing.”<sup>2</sup> Moreover, that

<sup>1</sup> Local Rule 251(e) excepts the joint statement requirement where there has been a complete and total failure to respond to the requested discovery or where the only relief sought by the motion is the imposition of sanctions. Here, the parties’ briefing makes clear that defendant received a response to requested discovery and defendant’s motion to compel seeks more than just the imposition of sanctions.

<sup>2</sup> This information is available at: <http://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/judges/all-judges/united-states-magistrate-judge-allison-claire-ac/>

1 standing order also explains that the undersigned “strictly enforces meet and confer  
2 requirements,” and that prior to the filing of the joint statement, “the parties must **confer in**  
3 **person or via telephone or video conferencing** in an attempt to resolve the dispute.” (emphasis  
4 in original).

5 Here, the parties have not filed a joint statement re discovery disagreement, but instead  
6 filed a motion, an opposition and a reply. (ECF Nos. 56, 61 & 62.) Moreover, the parties’  
7 briefing fails to detail the parties’ attempts at meeting and conferring. Local Rule 110 provides  
8 that the failure to comply with the Local Rules or any order of this court “may be grounds for  
9 imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions authorized by statute or Rule or within the  
10 inherent power of the Court.” See also Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (“Failure  
11 to follow a district court’s local rules is a proper ground for dismissal.”).


12 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that:

13 1. The February 24, 2016 hearing of defendants’ motion to compel (ECF No. 56) is  
14 continued to **March 9, 2016, at 10:00 a.m.** in Courtroom No. 26.

15 2. On or before March 2, 2016, the parties shall file a joint statement re discovery  
16 disagreement that complies with the undersigned’s standing order and the Local Rules of this  
17 court; and

18 3. On or before March 2, 2016 the parties shall show cause, in writing, as to why  
19 sanctions should not be imposed for their failure to comply with the Local Rules and the order of  
20 this court.

21 DATED: February 22, 2016

22   
23 ALLISON CLAIRE  
24 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
25  
26  
27  
28