

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

United States District Court
Northern District of California

JACKSON FAMILY WINES, INC., et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
DIAGEO NORTH AMERICA, INC., et
al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 11-5639 EMC (JSC)
**ORDER RE: DISCOVERY DISPUTES
(DKT. NOS. 67-69)**

The Court is receipt of the parties’ joint discovery letter regarding Plaintiffs’ Rule 30(b)(6) notice (Dkt. No. 67), Plaintiffs’ statement requesting leave to depose Jennifer Josephson (Dkt. No. 68), and Defendants’ statement seeking to compel Plaintiffs to produce documents (Dkt. No. 69). In its previous Order, the Court ordered that “[b]efore any further discovery disputes are filed with the Court, the parties must meet and confer in person, alternating between each side’s office unless they agree otherwise.” (Dkt. No. 61 at 1.) Although the parties’ letters and statements assert that they have met and conferred, the parties fail to specify whether they have done so in-person. The parties are accordingly ordered to submit a statement to this Court regarding when and where the parties’ in-person

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

meet-and-confer occurred. The Court notes that discussions of discovery disputes during a deposition do not qualify as an in-person meet-and-confer.

If the parties have met and conferred in-person regarding the disputes contained in Docket Numbers 68 and 69, the parties are further ordered to file joint discovery letters concerning those disputes pursuant to the Court’s Standing Orders by Thursday, July 18, 2013. Because the parties’ individual statements complied with Local Rule 37-3, these joint letters will be deemed timely.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 15, 2013



JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE