1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE NCAA STUDENT-ATHLETE NAME AND LIKENESS LICENSING LITIGATION,

No. C 09-1967 CW No. MC 11-80300 CW No. MC 12-80020 CW

ORDER ON ANTITRUST PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM NON-DISPOSITIVE PRETRIAL ORDER OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE

On March 8, 2012, Antitrust Plaintiffs filed a motion requesting relief from a non-dispositive pretrial order entered by a Magistrate Judge on February 27, 2012, in which the Magistrate Judge issued sanctions against Antitrust Plaintiffs related to their subpoenas requesting documents from nonparties The Big Ten Conference, The Big Ten Network and Fox Broadcasting Company and denied their motions to compel production by the nonparties.

In his order, the Magistrate Judge gave The Big Ten Conference, The Big Ten Network and Fox Broadcasting Company leave to file a motion for sanctions against Antitrust Plaintiffs, and they subsequently did so. The Court notes that, in their opposition to these motions, Antitrust Plaintiffs have raised many of the same arguments that they made in their motion for relief. A hearing on these motions is scheduled for April 18, 2012 before the Magistrate Judge.

To the extent that Antitrust Plaintiffs seek relief from the Magistrate Judge's denial of their motions to compel, the Court DENIES their motion for relief. Antitrust Plaintiffs have not

established that the Magistrate Judge's order was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

The Court also DENIES Antitrust Plaintiffs' motion for relief from the imposition of sanctions, because they are currently seeking the same relief from the Magistrate Judge. Antitrust Plaintiffs may renew their motion for relief after the Magistrate Judge has issued his decision regarding the pending motions for sanctions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 4/9/2012

CLAUDIA WILKEN United States District Judge