

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
10 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
11 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**  
12

13 MICHELLE LOU, and others,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

16 MA LABORATORIES, INC., and others,

17 Defendants.  
18

Case No. 12-cv-05409 WHA (NC)

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS’  
MOTION FOR SANCTIONS**

Re: Dkt. No. 222

19  
20 Plaintiffs moved to compel defendants to produce e-discovery in a usable format, or  
21 in the alternative requested monetary sanctions. Dkt. No. 222. The Court ordered the  
22 production to be in an easily usable Excel format, but took the sanctions motion under  
23 submission pending the defendants’ completion of the production at issue. Dkt. No. 224.

24 “District Courts have broad discretion in imposing discovery sanctions. *Ritchie v.*  
25 *United States*, 451 F.3d 1019, 1026 (9th Cir. 2006). Federal Rule of Civil Procedure  
26 37(b)(2) states that if a party “fails to obey an order to provide or permit discovery” a court  
27 “may issue further just orders,” including awarding monetary sanctions. Fed. R. Civ. P.  
28 37(b)(2).


Case No. 12-cv-05409 WHA (NC),  
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS’  
MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

1 The Court denies plaintiffs' motion for sanctions for lack of good cause and a failure  
2 to meet and confer prior to moving for sanctions. The parties were eventually able to agree  
3 on the proper format of documents and defendants completed the production as required.  
4 Given that compliance and the overall behavior of both parties during the lengthy discovery  
5 process, sanctions are not warranted. Plaintiffs' motion is therefore denied.

6 Any party may object to this order within 14 days. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a).

7  
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Date: March 25, 2014

10   
11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 Nathanael M. Cousins  
13 United States Magistrate Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28