

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

RITA C HO,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
MARK PINSUKANJANA, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 17-cv-06520-PJH

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
RELIEF FROM NON-DISPOSITIVE  
PRETRIAL ORDER OF MAGISTRATE  
JUDGE**

Re: Dkt. No. 80

Before the court is plaintiff's motion pursuant to Civil Local Rule 72-2 for relief from a discovery order issued by Magistrate Judge Thomas Hixson.

A district court's review of a magistrate judge's pretrial order is conducted under a "clearly erroneous or contrary to law standard." Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). A magistrate judge's resolution of a discovery dispute is "entitled to great deference." Doubt v. NCR Corp., No. 09-cv-5917-SBA, 2011 WL 5914284, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 28, 2011). A district court should not overturn a magistrate judge's order simply because it "might have weighed differently the various interests and equities," but rather "must ascertain whether the order was contrary to law." See Rivera v. NIBCO, Inc., 364 F.3d 1057, 1063 (9th Cir. 2004).

The court finds nothing in Judge Hixson's order that is erroneous or contrary to law. Accordingly, plaintiff's objections are overruled, and the motion is DENIED.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: February 8, 2019



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
United States District Judge