

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
For the Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
Northern District of California
San Francisco Division

GEORGIA-PACIFIC LLC,
Plaintiff,

No. C 12-02797 WHO (LB)

**ORDER REGARDING DISCOVERY
DISPUTE AT ECF NO. 196**

v.

OFFICEMAX INC, et al.,
Defendants.

_____ /
In the parties' discovery dispute at ECF No. 196 (filed on June 27, 2014), OfficeMax wants the court to compel the deposition of the Rule 30(b)(6) ESI witness in two weeks (so by mid-July) as opposed to in late July, which is when other depositions already are scheduled in Atlanta. Joint Discovery Dispute, ECF No. 196 at 1-2. It alternatively asks for discovery deadlines to be extended by 30 days. *Id.* at 2. GP responds that it makes no sense to incur these extra costs for the three-hour deposition just to have it two weeks earlier. *Id.* Considering the circumstances, the court orders that the deposition occur in late July along with the other depositions.

At the June 30, 2014 hearing, the court asked OfficeMax why this issue required a thirty-day discovery extension. Boiled down, the concern is that late disclosure of information might prejudice OfficeMax's ability to prepare its case adequately (particularly given that the court ordered the deposition in April). On this record, and given the trial date, there is no ground to extend discovery deadlines (and normally, a request to extend deadlines needs to be made to the district court). That

1 being said, if OfficeMax learns information at a late date that requires additional time to address
2 appropriately, it may raise the issue with the undersigned, who will work facilitate the orderly
3 completion of discovery.

4 This disposes of ECF No. 196.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated: June 30, 2014



LAUREL BEELER
United States Magistrate Judge

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28