

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

No. C 08-00822 SI

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS’  
DISCOVERY REQUEST  
[Docket No. 62]**

v.

MEDLAB INC., et al.,

Defendants.

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

Defendants have filed a letter brief seeking sanctions and an order compelling plaintiff to produce a second Rule 30(b)(6) witness. Defendants contend that Dean C. Graybill, plaintiff’s designated Rule 30(b)(6) witness, was insufficient because he testified at deposition that he lacked knowledge to testify about various matters.

The most obvious problem with defendants’ request is that Mr. Graybill’s deposition was taken on October 18, 2008, and defendants did not file their letter brief until February 24, 2009, the same day that they filed their opposition to plaintiff’s summary judgment motion. The non-expert discovery cut-off in this case was November 14, 2008. Under Civil Local Rule 26-2, “no motions to compel fact discovery may be filed more than 7 court days after the fact discovery cut-off” unless good cause is shown. *See* Civ. Local R. 26-2. Defendants make no effort to explain their lengthy delay in filing their letter brief.


In addition, because defendants did not file their request until the same day they filed their opposition to plaintiff’s summary judgment motion, granting defendants’ request at this juncture would require continuing the summary judgment hearing. Defendants do not attempt to comply with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(f), which requires the party requesting such a continuance to show: “(1) it

1 has set forth in affidavit form the specific facts it hopes to elicit from further discovery; (2) the facts  
2 sought exist; and (3) the sought-after facts are essential to oppose summary judgment. Failure to  
3 comply with these requirements is a proper ground for denying discovery and proceeding to summary  
4 judgment.” *Family Home & Fin. Ctr. Inc. v. Fed. Home Loan Mortgage Corp.*, 525 F.3d 822, 827 (9th  
5 Cir. 2008) (internal citation omitted).

6 For these reasons, defendants’ requests for an order and for sanctions are DENIED.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8  
9 Dated: March 9, 2009

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
10 SUSAN ILLSTON  
11 United States District Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28