

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
5

6 CENTURY ALUMINUM CO., et al.,

7 Plaintiffs,

8 v.

9 AGCS MARINE INSURANCE CO.,

10 Defendant.

Case No. 11-cv-02514-YGR

**ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR RELIEF
FROM NONDISPOSITIVE PRETRIAL
ORDERS OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

11
12 Defendant AGCS Marine Insurance Company (“AGCS”) has filed three Motions for
13 Relief from Nondispositive Pretrial Orders of Magistrate Judge Cousins (Dkt. Nos. 220, 226 &
14 236), relating to Orders dated: (i) August 23, 2012 (Dkt. No. 206) as clarified on September 5,
15 2012 (Dkt. No. 219); (ii) August 28, 2012 (Dkt. No. 209) as modified on September 13, 2012
16 (Dkt. No. 234); and August 30, 2012 (Dkt. No. 216).

17 The Court, having considered the papers filed in support of these Motions (Dkt. Nos. 220–
18 224, 226–229 & 236–238), and other filings in the record (Dkt. Nos. 209–210, 214–216, 219,
19 234), including the transcript of the hearing on August 22, 2012, **HEREBY DENIES** each of
20 AGCS’s three Motions for Relief.

21 With respect to the consideration of each of these matters, the Court finds that Magistrate
22 Judge Cousins has reviewed and analyzed the parties’ positions thoroughly, provided more than
23 adequate opportunities for written and oral argument, and evaluated, in conscientious detail, the
24 claims of privilege, burden, and access to additional discovery raised by the parties. AGCS has
25 not persuaded the Court that any legal or equitable reason exists to provide the substantive
26 requested relief.

27 With respect to Judge Cousins Order dated August 23, 2012 (Dkt. No. 206), AGCS
28 requests relief not specifically addressed in the Order, namely, a provision for notification to non-

1 parties. In addition, compliance with each of the Orders is now past due. The Court has reviewed
2 the Joint Discovery Status Report filed on September 17, 2012. (Dkt. No. 240.) As the parties
3 have met and conferred on the issue of AGCS's timing for compliance, and are scheduled to meet
4 with Judge Cousins on September 19, 2012, the Court declines from ruling on issues of timing for
5 compliance and refers AGCS back to Judge Cousins to address in the first instance the issue of
6 notification to non-parties.

7 This Order terminates Dkt. Nos. 220, 226 & 236.

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9
10 Dated: September 18, 2012


YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28