Order, page 1

1	"(1)	"(1) <i>In General.</i> On notice to other parties and all affected persons, a party may move for an order compelling disclosure or discovery. The motion must include a certification that the movant has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with the person or party failing to make			
2					
3	disclosure or discovery in an effort to obtain it without court action.				
4		* * * *			
5	"(3)	Specific Motions.			
6		* * * *			
7		"(B)		ompel a Discovery Response. A party seeking very may move for an order compelling an answer,	
8		designation, production, or inspection. This motion may be made if:			
9			"(i)	a deponent fails to answer a question	
10			. ,	asked under Rules 30 or 31;"	
11	Thus, a motion to compel is authorized only after a party "fails to make discovery"				
12	or "fails to answer a question asked under Rules 30 or 31." Nothing in the rule authorizes the court				
13	to issue an order compelling a deposition before the party fails to appear and answer questions. ¹				
14	The rule that governs a situation where a party fails entirely to appear for a duly noticed				
15	deposition is Rule 37(d), which provides in relevant part:				
16	"(1)	In General.			
17		"(A)		on; Grounds for Sanctions. The court where the is pending may, on motion, order sanctions if:	
18			"(i)	a party or a party's officer, director, or managing agent	
19				— or a person designated under Rule 30(b)(6) or 31(a)(4) — fails, after being served with proper notice,	
20	to appear for that person's deposition; or				
21	* * * *				
22	"(2)	Unacceptable Excuse for Failing to Act. A failure described in Rule 37(d)(1)(A) is not excused on the ground that the discovery sought was objectionable, unless the party failing to act has a pending motion for a protective order under Rule 26(c)."			
23					
24	protective order under Kule 20(c).				
25	Until and unless Defendant Ernst & Young fails to appear for a properly noticed deposition, a				
26					
27	The court appreciates that Lead Plaintiff was attempting to confer with Defendant Ernst & Young regarding the date for the deposition. However, when the parties could not agree on a date				
28	for the deposition, it was incumbent on Lead Plaintiff to choose a date and notice the deposition. After that, if Defendant Ernst & Young objected to the date selected, it would be free to file a motion				
	for protective order if warranted.				

motion to compel is premature.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this order is without prejudice to a renewed motion to compel, and a motion for sanctions pursuant to Rule 37(d), if Defendant Ernst & Young fails to appear for a properly noticed deposition without filing a motion for a protective order under Rule 26(c).

Dated: 9/28/09

PATRICIA V. TRUMBULL United States Magistrate Judge