

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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

PATRICK RULO,
Plaintiff,
v.
RICOH AMERICAS CORPORATION, et
al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [15-cv-00736-HSG](#) (JSC)

ORDER RE: DISCOVERY DISPUTE

Re: Dkt. No. 24

Plaintiff Patrick Rulo (“Plaintiff”) brings this wrongful termination action against his former employer, Defendants Ricoh Americas Corp., as well as Ricoh USA, Inc. and a number of Doe Defendants. This action has been referred to the undersigned magistrate judge for resolution of discovery disputes. (Dkt. No. 26.) Now pending before the Court is discovery dispute pertaining to (1) Defendants’ boilerplate objections to Plaintiff’s discovery requests; (2) whether Plaintiff waived objections to Defendants’ written discovery requests, (3) the scheduling of Plaintiff’s deposition, and (4) the parties’ Stipulation for ADR Conference—namely, the type of ADR requested.¹ (Dkt. No. 24.) The parties did not submit a complete joint letter brief addressing all of these issues; instead, Plaintiff submitted a declaration along with a copy of the latest draft of the parties’ joint letter brief that addressed only the second and third issues above. (Dkt. No. 24 ¶ 10; Dkt. No. 24-1.) Although Defendants’ perspective is reflected at least in part in the draft joint letter brief, because Plaintiff ultimately submitted the discovery dispute to the Court unilaterally, the Court will provide Defendants an opportunity to respond. Defendants shall

¹ Plaintiff also raised the issue of the need for a Stipulated Protective Order, but the district court entered the parties’ Stipulated Protective Order shortly after Plaintiff filed her declaration describing the discovery dispute. (Dkt. No. 25.)

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

submit a brief response to the issues Plaintiff raised by close of business on **Friday, October 23, 2015**. For all future discovery disputes, the parties must comply with all provisions of the Court's Standing Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 22, 2015


JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY
United States Magistrate Judge