

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHARLES RIDGWAY, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
WAL-MART STORES, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. [08-cv-05221-SI](#)

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S
MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
NONDISPOSITIVE PRETRIAL ORDER
OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE DATED
MARCH 11, 2016**


Re: Dkt. No. 267

Defendant Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., has filed a motion for relief from a nondispositive pretrial order of a magistrate judge. Docket No. 267. Defendant seeks disclosure of unredacted copies (i.e. with names and addresses) of all survey responses from a 2014 survey that plaintiffs' counsel conducted among class members. On March 11, 2016, Chief Magistrate Judge Joseph C. Spero issued an order following a hearing on the discovery dispute. Docket No. 263. Defendant then moved for relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a), and Civil Local Rule 72-2. Docket No. 276 at 1-2.

The Court has reviewed the parties' papers, the transcript from the March 11, 2016 hearing, and Judge Spero's order. The Court finds nothing in the hearing transcript or in Judge Spero's order that is "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). Moreover, the Court agrees that Judge Spero's order strikes the appropriate balance between the competing interests at stake. Accordingly, the Court DENIES defendant's motion for relief.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 18, 2016



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge