

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

RESOLUTE FOREST PRODUCTS, INC.,
et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GREENPEACE INTERNATIONAL, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 17-cv-02824-JST (KAW)

**ORDER TERMINATING JOINT
DISCOVERY LETTER**

Re: Dkt. No. 274

On August 20, 2019, the parties filed a joint discovery letter regarding whether Defendants should be required to begin production of documents while the presiding judge resolves Plaintiff's objection to the undersigned's July 24, 2019 order regarding the scope of discovery. (Discovery Letter, Dkt. No. 274 at 1.) The discovery letter included a 54-page attachment. (See Dkt. No. 274-1.)

Per the Court's standing order, "[a]ny attachments **shall not exceed 12 pages.**" (Westmore Standing Ord. ¶ 14.) Moreover, the parties were previously warned that "the Court may terminate any discovery letter that fails to comply with the Civil Local Rules and the Court's standing order. If the parties require additional pages, they should request leave of Court." (Dkt. No. 269 at 2 n.1.)

The parties did not request additional pages prior to filing the 54-page attachment. Accordingly, the Court **TERMINATES** the discovery letter. The parties shall file an administrative motion requesting an extension of the page limit prior to filing an overlarge document.

That said, the Court notes that it is not clear why Defendants are unable to proceed with certain discovery where there is no dispute. For example, there can be no real dispute that


United States District Court
Northern District of California

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

information about Defendant Moas’s December 2016 letter and the May 2017 Clearcutting report is discoverable. (See Dkt. No. 246 at 17-19.) Indeed, Defendants do not suggest that all of Plaintiffs’ requests seek information or documents that are not discoverable. Further, to the extent Defendants seek a stay of discovery pending the resolution of Plaintiffs’ objection, that pertains to case management, which is in the purview of the presiding judge. The undersigned cannot stay discovery or extend the discovery schedule.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 26, 2019


KANDIS A. WESTMORE
United States Magistrate Judge