1 2 3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 4 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 5 6 7 SYNCHRONOSS TECHNOLOGIES, INC., Case No. 16-cv-00119-HSG 8 Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM NON-9 v. DISPOSITIVE PRETRIAL ORDER 10 DROPBOX INC., et al., Re: Dkt. No. 142 11 Defendants. 12 13 On September 5, 2017, Magistrate Judge Kandis A. Westmore denied Plaintiff's request to strike portions of a declaration by Defendant's expert, Dr. Michael J. Freedman, and granted 14 15 Defendant's request to strike the declaration of Christopher Alpaugh, Plaintiff's expert. Dkt. No. 141. On September 19, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion for relief from Judge Westmore's order. 16 Dkt. No. 142. On September 29, 2017, Defendant filed an opposition. Dkt. No. 146. The Court 17 18 has carefully reviewed Judge Westmore's order, Plaintiff's motion, Defendant's opposition, and 19 the relevant legal authorities. Judge Westmore's order is well-reasoned and thorough. The Court affirms the non-dispositive order because it is not "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." See 20 Grimes v. City & Cty. of San Francisco, 951 F.2d 236, 240 (9th Cir. 1991). Accordingly, the 21 Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion for relief from Judge Westmore's non-dispositive pretrial order. 22 23 IT IS SO ORDERED. 24 Dated: 10/24/2017 25 26 27 United States District Judge 28