

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
28UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIAFEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Plaintiff,
v.
DIRECTV, INC., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 15-cv-01129-HSG

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM NONDISPOSITIVE
PRETRIAL ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 126

On March 30, 2016, non-party Paula Selis filed a motion for nondispositive relief from the Magistrate Judge's order directing Ms. Selis to sit for a three-hour oral deposition. See Dkt. No. 122.

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72, a district judge may set aside a magistrate judge's non-dispositive pretrial order only if it is "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). "The magistrate's factual determinations are reviewed for clear error, and the magistrate's legal conclusions are reviewed to determine whether they are contrary to law." *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, 268 F.R.D. 344, 348 (N.D. Cal. 2010). "When the court reviews the magistrate's determination of relevance in a discovery order, the Court must review the magistrate's order with an eye toward the broad standard of relevance in the discovery context. Thus, the standard of review in most instances is not the explicit statutory language, but the clearly implicit standard of abuse of discretion." *Id.* at 348 (internal quotation marks omitted). The Court can overturn the "magistrate's factual determinations only if the court reaches a definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed." *Id.* (citations and internal quotation marks omitted). "This standard is extremely deferential and the [m]agistrate's rulings should be considered the final decisions of the [d]istrict [c]ourt." *Otey v. CrowdFlower, Inc.*, No. 12-CV-05524-JST, 2013 WL 3456942, at *1 (N.D. Cal. July 8, 2013) (internal quotation

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

marks omitted).

The Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s order and finds no clear error of fact or legal conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the motion to set aside the Magistrate Judge’s order is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 4/22/2016


HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
United States District Judge