

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6

7 OJMAR US, LLC,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 SECURITY PEOPLE, INC., et al.,

11 Defendants.

Case No. [16-cv-04948-HSG](#)

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF OJMAR
U.S., LLC'S MOTION FOR RELIEF
FROM NON-DISPOSITIVE PRETRIAL
ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 88

12 On June 12, 2017, Magistrate Judge Maria Elena-James issued a discovery order, Dkt. No.
13 83, resolving the parties' joint letter brief, Dkt. No. 75-4. On June 15, 2017, Plaintiff Ojmar U.S.,
14 LLC ("Ojmar") filed a motion for relief from one aspect of Judge James' order. See Dkt. No. 88
15 at 3–5 (objecting to the order insofar as it limited discovery from attorney Frear Stephen Schmid
16 to the time period prior to service of the complaint in the '180 patent case). Plaintiff's motion is
17 unopposed and pending before the Court. Having carefully reviewed the relevant papers and legal
18 authorities, the Court finds Judge James' order to be well-reasoned and thorough. The Court
19 affirms the non-dispositive order because it is not "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." See
20 *Grimes v. City & County of San Francisco*, 951 F.2d 236, 240 (9th Cir. 1991). Accordingly, the
21 Court **DENIES** Ojmar's motion for relief from Judge James' non-dispositive pretrial order.¹

22 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

23 Dated: 7/10/2017

24 
25 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
26 United States District Judge

27 _____
28 ¹ The Court finds this matter suitable for disposition without a hearing. See Civil L.R. 72-2
("Unless otherwise ordered by the assigned District Judge, . . . no hearing will be held concerning
the motion.")