

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  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

JESSICA LEE, individually and on behalf of  
a class of similarly situated individuals,

Plaintiff,

v.

STONEBRIDGE LIFE INSURANCE  
COMPANY, et al.,

Defendants.

No. C 11-0043 RS

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
SHORTEN TIME, WITHOUT  
PREJUDICE, AND REFERRING  
DISCOVERY DISPUTES TO  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Defendant Stonebridge Life Insurance Company moves, pursuant to Local Rule 6-3 for an order shortening time to brief and hear a motion to compel, which it asserts it intends to file on September 13, 2012. Pursuant to Northern District Local Rule 72-1, the Court hereby refers the yet-to-be-filed motion to compel and any further discovery disputes that may arise in this action to a randomly assigned Magistrate Judge for resolution. Stonebridge shall comply with any standing orders or procedures of the Magistrate Judge for obtaining resolution of the issues presented by its motion to compel, whether on shortened time or otherwise. The request for an order shortening time is therefore denied, without prejudice.

At this juncture, the only reason Stonebridge has offered as to why expedited consideration of the motion to compel is necessary is the existing briefing schedule and hearing date for plaintiff's class certification motion. Stonebridge has not suggested undue prejudice would result from a continuance of that schedule, should it prove necessary. Accordingly, in his or her discretion, the

1 Magistrate Judge may require Stonebridge to make such a showing in connection with any renewed  
2 request to have the motion to compel issues resolved on shortened time. Unless the Magistrate  
3 Judge concludes that the motion to compel issues should and reasonably can be disposed of in  
4 adequate time to maintain the current briefing schedule and hearing date for class certification, the  
5 Court will issue an order setting new dates.

6  
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8  
9 Dated: September 12, 2012

10  
11   
12 RICHARD SEEBORG  
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28