I

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	
10	EMIL P. MILYAKOV and MAGDALENA A. No. C 11-02066 WHA
11	APOSTOLOVA,
12	Plaintiffs, ORDER ON EX PARTE
13	v. APPLICATION FOR A HEARING FOR AN ORDER TO COMPEL
14	JP MORGAN CHASE, N.A., HSBC BANK USA, NA, CALIFORNIA RECONVEYANCE CO., PAUL FINANCIAL, LLC, MORTGAGE DEFENDANTS' DEPOSITIONS
15	ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SYSTEMS,
16	INC. (MERS), FOUNDATION CONVEYANCING, LLC, and DOES 1
17	through 100,
18	Defendants/
19	
20	On November 2, 2011, pro se plaintiffs filed an ex parte application for a motion to

compel defendants' depositions and set the matter for hearing on November 3, at 8 a.m. (Dkt. No. 63). Defendants submitted an opposition to the motion.

Pursuant to paragraph 25 of the Court's Supplemental Order, "requests for discovery relief must first be summarized in a letter no longer than three pages from the party seeking relief after having met and conferred." A previous order put plaintiffs on notice of this requirement, as did the filing of the Supplemental Order itself (Dkt. Nos. 22, 54). It is unclear from the submissions whether the parties met and conferred on the issues regarding this discovery dispute, as is required. Plaintiffs' motion is thereby STRICKEN. The motion hearing is VACATED.

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

Plaintiffs are also seeking to remand this case to state court on the basis that this Court does not have subject matter jurisdiction (Dkt. No. 58). Thus, it would be improper for the Court to take further action prior to resolving the motion to remand.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 3, 2011.

Mrs April

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE