

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

HAROLD BLACK,

No. C 08-1344 SI

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR DISCOVERY**

v.

JOHN E. POTTER, Postmaster General,

Defendant.

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

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


By letter brief, plaintiff seeks resolution of a dispute concerning defendant's compliance with plaintiff's discovery requests. [Docket # 16]. Defendant responds that plaintiff failed to confer with defense counsel before filing his letter with the Court. [Docket # 17].

Discovery requests and responses normally are exchanged between the parties without any copy sent to the court. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(d) (listing discovery requests and responses that "must not" be filed with the court until they are used in the proceeding or the court orders otherwise). Only when the parties have a specific discovery dispute that they cannot resolve among themselves should the parties consider asking the court to intervene in the discovery process. To promote the goal of addressing only very specific disagreements (rather than becoming an overseer of all discovery), the court requires that the parties meet and confer to try to resolve their disagreements before seeking court intervention. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(2)(B); N.D. Cal. Local Rule 37.

Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for discovery is DENIED and plaintiff is directed to contact defense counsel to discuss the matters raised in plaintiff's letter.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: October 2, 2008

  
SUSAN ILLSTON  
United States District Judge