

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
San Francisco

MARITZ PINEL, No. C 10-3118 SBA (LB)
Plaintiff(s), DISCOVERY ORDER
 v.
 AURORA LOAN SERVICES, LLC,
Defendant(s).

The court held a telephonic discovery conference and ordered that the 30(b)(6) deposition should proceed. The deponent is available tomorrow, and Plaintiffs should try to avail themselves of the opportunities in this deposition. That being said, if Plaintiffs determine that the production of 250 pages of documents (apparently 14 contracts) relevant to the loan modifications cannot be asked about with the reasonable exercise of diligence during this deposition, the court will allow them additional time at another time without counting against any deposition limits or time. That being said, and as the court said on the record, it may be that such follow-up can be accomplished without enormous expense. The court will visit the costs issue if and when it comes up, but as the court said to the parties, it ordinarily would consider follow-up mechanisms to minimize costs. The court thus encourages Plaintiffs to do what they can now, but it also will give Plaintiffs the opportunity to do their job (if that is what Plaintiffs say is at stake if and when this issue comes up again).

The court also directs the parties to e-file their joint discovery letter dated August 29, 2012 so that the record is complete.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 29, 2012



 LAUREL BEELER
 United States Magistrate Judge