

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

STANISLAV PETROV,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
ALAMEDA COUNTY, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [4:16-cv-04323-YGR](#) (KAW)  
**ORDER TERMINATING JOINT  
DISCOVERY LETTER**  
Re: Dkt. No. 60

On February 28, 2017, the district court clarified its previous order regarding the stay in discovery, deferred ruling on the parties' requests regarding the production of personnel files, and referred any discovery disputes regarding same to the undersigned. (Dkt. No. 61.) Accordingly, the February 24, 2017 joint discovery letter is terminated, and the parties are ordered to meet and confer in an attempt to resolve the pending dispute without court intervention. If those efforts fail to fully resolve all issues of contention, the parties shall jointly write and file a letter outlining any remaining disputes in the format outlined in the Court's Standing Order:

**A. Request No. 3**

[Summarize the issue and reproduce the request.]

Plaintiff's Position

[Plaintiff's position outlining why Defendant's response or position is deficient and the relief requested.]

Defendant's Position

[Defendant's rationale as to why it has fully responded to the request, etc.]

**B. Request No. 4**

[Summarize the issue and reproduce the request.]

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

Plaintiff's Position

[Plaintiff's position outlining why Defendant's response or position is deficient and the relief requested.]


Defendant's Position

[Defendant's rationale as to why it has fully responded to the request, etc.]

(See Judge Westmore's General Standing Order ¶ 13.) Compliance with the format provided will facilitate the Court's resolution of any remaining disputes, as the parties will be addressing the same issues. Additionally, for each disputed request, the parties should address Rule 26's proportionality requirement.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 21, 2017

  
KANDIS A. WESTMORE  
United States Magistrate Judge