1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9	
10	GERALD SIMPSON,
11	Plaintiff, No. C 15-05611 WHA
12	V.
13	RITE AID CORPORATION, ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR FURTHER CASE
14	Defendant. / MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
15	
16	Defendant Rite Aid Corporation has filed an administrative motion requesting a further
17	case management conference to seek clarification on the deadline for initial disclosures. The
18	case management order states: "All initial disclosures under FRCP 26 must be completed by
19	MAY 25, 2016, on pain of preclusion under FRCP 37(c), including full and faithful compliance
20	with FRCP 26(a)(1)(A)(iii)."
21	According to Rite Aid's administrative motion, the parties disagree about the following:
22	The parties seek clarification on whether the Court's order means that: (1) all first-round initial disclosures in the cases must be
23	completed by May 25, 2016, but that the parties may continue to supplement the disclosures as discovery proceeds (plaintiff's
24	interpretation of the Court's order), or (2) any and all disclosures must be made by this deadline, and the parties may not
25	supplement the disclosures after this deadline (Rite Aid's interpretation of the Court's order).
26	FRCP 26(a)(1) does not differentiate between "first-round" initial disclosures and later-round
27	initial disclosures. Rather it describes all initial disclosures that "a party must, without awaiting
28	a discovery request, provide to the parties." The case management order set May 25 as the

United States District Court For the Northern District of California deadline for "[a]ll initial disclosures." FRCP 26(e) describes the process for supplementing
initial disclosures and supplements must genuinely qualify as supplements. Rite Aid's motion
requesting a further case management conference for the Court to explain how FRCP 26 works
is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 20, 2016.

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE