

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

MICHELLE HILL, an individual, and
ARIEL EPSTEIN POLLACK, an
individual,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JETBLUE AIRWAYS CORPORATION, a
Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

No. 2:17-cv-1604 WBS DB

ERICKA BOHNEL, an individual, and
ROSA MARTINEZ, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JETBLUE AIRWAYS CORPORATION, a
Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

No. 2:18-cv-0081 WBS DB

ORDER

On January 4, 2021, and January 6, 2021, plaintiffs filed motions to compel in these
related actions and noticed the motions for hearing before the undersigned on February 5, 2021,

////

1 pursuant to Local Rule 302(c)(1). On January 29, 2021, the parties filed Joint Statements re
2 Discovery Disagreement pursuant to Local Rule 251.

3 The Joint Statements reflect that the parties last meet and confer occurred on December
4 29, 2020, prior to the filing of the motions to compel. However, the undersigned's Standard
5 Information re discovery disputes set forth on the court's web page explains that parties must
6 meet and confer prior to filing a discovery motion and "must again confer in person or via
7 telephone or video conferencing" prior to the filing of the joint statement. See
8 [http://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/judges/all-judges/united-states-magistrate-](http://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/judges/all-judges/united-states-magistrate-judge-deborah-barnes-db)
9 [judge-deborah-barnes-db.](http://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/judges/all-judges/united-states-magistrate-judge-deborah-barnes-db)

10 The failure to comply with the undersigned's meet and confer requirements is especially
11 problematic here as defendant asserts that the parties never met and conferred on several topics of
12 dispute. Moreover, defendant represents that it already agreed to provide plaintiff with a
13 supplemental production prior to the February 5, 2021 hearing. It is difficult for the undersigned
14 to help the parties resolve discovery disputes when those disputes have not been clearly
15 articulated and briefed.

16 For the reasons stated above, plaintiffs' motions to compel will be denied without
17 prejudice to renewal. The parties should engage in further meet and confer, in compliance with
18 the Local Rules and the undersigned's Standard Information. If, after further meeting and
19 conferring a dispute remains, plaintiffs may file a motion to compel and the parties may file a
20 Joint Statement, again ensuring compliance with the Local Rules and the undersigned's Standard
21 Information.

22 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

23 1. Plaintiffs Hill and Esptein-Pollack's January 4, 2021 motion to compel (ECF No. 48) is
24 denied without prejudice to renewal;

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

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

2. Plaintiffs Bohnel and Martinez’s January 6, 2021 motion to compel (ECF No. 45) is denied without prejudice to renewal; and

3. The February 5, 2021 hearing is vacated.

Dated: February 1, 2021



DEBORAH BARNES
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DLB:6
DB/orders/orders.civil/hill1604.m&c.ord