

1
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4

5 JOHN ZEMAN,
6 Plaintiff,
7 v.
8 TWITTER, INC., et al.,
9 Defendants.

Case No. [23-cv-01786-SI](#)

**ORDER RE: DECEMBER 13, 2024
DISCOVERY DISPUTE**

Re: Dkt. No. 97

10
11 The Court received a joint brief outlining a discovery dispute in which defendant asked the
12 Court to compel plaintiff to respond to twenty-six requests for production and fourteen
13 interrogatories (jointly, “the requests”). Dkt. No. 97. Defendant first served the requests on August
14 23, 2024. *Id.* After 30 days had passed, plaintiff asked three separate times for one additional week
15 to respond. *Id.* Then plaintiff changed his position and asked to postpone responses until after the
16 opt-in period closes on January 21, 2025. *Id.* The Court orders plaintiff to respond to the requests
17 by January 15, 2025.

18 While plaintiff has not timely objected to the requests, the Court finds good cause to excuse
19 this failure. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(b)(4). Plaintiff’s counsel and defendants are engaged in fluid
20 discovery across dozens of cases involving the same set of events and while plaintiff’s position here
21 was incorrect, it was not unreasonably held. Accordingly, plaintiff’s right to present objections or
22 assert privileges in his responses is not waived.

23
24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25 Dated: December 18, 2024

26 

27 SUSAN ILLSTON
28 United States District Judge