

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

BLINGLET, INC.,

No. C 09-05156 SI

Plaintiff,

**ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S DISCOVERY
LETTER**

v.

(Docket No. 47)

AMBER ALERT SAFETY CENTERS, INC.,
et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff has submitted a letter to the Court detailing the status of the parties' efforts to schedule depositions of certain witnesses. Plaintiff has recently filed an amended complaint alleging new theories against new defendants, and defendant Amber Alert has recently had a change of counsel. As a result, certain deposition dates have been delayed and other depositions have yet to be scheduled.

From plaintiff's letter, it is not clear what action plaintiff wishes the Court to take. Plaintiff simply states at the end of the letter that, "To the extent the Court is willing to schedule a conference call among counsel to discuss these issues, we welcome the Court's intervention." The Court will, at the parties' request, schedule either a formal case management conference or a telephone conference, but the Court will not referee abstract discovery concerns prior to serious and concrete efforts by the parties to resolve the disputes themselves. Nothing in the letter briefs suggests that they have done so yet, so the pending request is DENIED..

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 26, 2010



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge