

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

BOON RAWD TRADING
INTERNATIONAL CO., LTD.,

No. C 09-05617 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER REQUESTING
EXPLANATION**

PALEEWONG TRADING CO. INC.,

Defendant.

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS

On December 7, 2010, plaintiff Boon Rawd Trading International Company filed a motion to compel discovery or for sanctions against defendant Paleewong Trading Company. On January 12, 2011, starting at 10:00 a.m., counsel conducted a meet-and-confer session pursuant to court order. At 2:00 p.m., argument was heard on the parties' outstanding issues, and a further meet-and-confer session was ordered. By 3:00 p.m., all issues were resolved, and two agreements were stated on the record.

Counsel were instructed to submit a single proposed order reciting these two agreements, but instead, each side submitted its own version of a proposed order — one with three supposed agreements, and the other with four. Neither proposed order was submitted with any documentation either representing that the parties agreed to the content of the proposed order or explaining why the parties were unable to reach agreement. The first of these dueling proposed

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

orders was submitted by Attorney Enoch Wang on behalf of Paleewong, on January 14, 2011.
The second was submitted by Attorney Ryan Meckfessel on behalf of Boon Rawd, on January 17.

Attorney Enoch Wang is directed to file a sworn declaration explaining why he filed the first proposed order in a manner that implied it had been jointly stipulated, without disclosing the parties' disagreement as to its contents. This sworn declaration must be filed by **NOON ON JANUARY 20, 2011.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 18, 2011.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE