

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  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EMIL LAWRENCE,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN  
FRANCISCO, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [14-cv-00820-MEJ](#)  
**ORDER RE: DISCOVERY DEADLINE**  
Re: Dkt. No. 66

On October 20, 2015, Plaintiff Emil Lawrence filed a motion to reopen discovery to: (1) seek unredacted versions of documents Defendant already produced, arguing they were not properly redacted in the first place; (2) seek documents he contends Defendant improperly withheld from production; and (3) allow him to take the deposition of three witnesses: officers Bonnel, Peters, and Enea. Dkt. No. 66. On July 31, 2015, this Court appointed counsel to represent Plaintiff, who prior to that date was an unrepresented litigant. Dkt. No. 55. After reviewing Plaintiff’s discovery requests and Defendant’s responses, Plaintiff’s “counsel concluded that City’s responses and production did not comply with its discovery obligations and that Lawrence had not completed discovery necessary to prepare for trial or to productively participate in settlement discussions.” White Decl. ¶¶ 6-8 & Ex. A, Dkt. No. 66-1. Under the Court’s Case Management Order, discovery closed on February 10, 2015. Dkt. No. 19.

Having reviewed Plaintiff’s motion, the Court finds good cause may exist to reopen discovery, as it will benefit both the parties’ settlement negotiations and, if negotiations are unsuccessful, resolution of this case on the merits. Accordingly, the Court ORDERS the parties to meet in confer in person to determine whether they can stipulate to reopening discovery on grounds that are beneficial to both parties. If unable to agree to a stipulation, the parties shall file

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

a joint letter in compliance with the undersigned's Discovery Standing Order. As any briefing on this issue will be by joint letter rather than motion, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's Motion WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: October 21, 2015

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MARIA-ELENA JAMES  
United States Magistrate Judge