

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
7 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
8 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

9  
10 CENTURY ALUMINUM COMPANY, et al.,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 AGCS MARINE INSURANCE CO.,

14 Defendant.  
15  
16

Case No. 11-cv-02514 YGR (NC)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO  
COMPEL**

Re: Dkt. No. 66

17  
18 The parties submitted a joint supplemental letter brief concerning their continued  
19 dispute as to Century Aluminum's responses to interrogatories Nos. 8, 14, and 16. Dkt.  
20 No. 66. Since filing their initial letter briefs, Dkt. Nos. 59, 60, and 62, and addressing the  
21 Court's order regarding meet and confer requirements, Dkt. No. 63, the parties have now  
22 resolved their differences as to interrogatories Nos. 10 and 12.

23 Regarding Century's responses to interrogatory No. 8, AGCS's motion to compel  
24 further responses is DENIED. To the extent AGCS wishes to discover "side agreements  
25 for discounts off of invoices for other repairs," Dkt. No. 66 at 2, it may do so in a separate  
26 interrogatory or by deposition. This topic was not specified in interrogatory No. 8.

27 AGCS's motion to compel further responses to interrogatories Nos. 14 and 16 is  
28 also DENIED. Century's production and identification of 30,000 responsive documents,

1 considered in the context of other discovery produced by Century, was sufficient under  
2 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d)(1).

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4  
5 DATED: February 24, 2012

6   
7 NATHANAEL M. COUSINS  
8 United States Magistrate Judge  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28