

United States District Court
For the 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

E-FILED on 7/21/10

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

MANDANA D. FARHANG and M.A.
MOBILE,

Plaintiffs,

v.

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
KHARAGPUR; TECHNOLOGY
ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND TRAINING
SOCIETY; PARTHA P. CHAKRABARTI;
PALLAB DASGUPTA; GURASHISH S.
BRAR; RAKESH GUPTA; PRAVANJAN
CHOUDHURY; SUBRAT PANDA;
ANIMESH NASKAR,

Defendants.

No. C-08-02658 RMW

DISCOVERY ORDER

[Re Docket No. 168]


Plaintiffs request an order scheduling a Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f) conference and allowing discovery to proceed. The court finds that the issues regarding the protective order and the trade secret disclosure list should be addressed prior to commencing further discovery. Plaintiffs are to either obtain a stipulation for a finalized protective order or file a motion with the magistrate judge to finalize a protective order. If defendant Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur ("IIT") feels that the trade secret disclosure list is not sufficiently specific, it must file a motion to compel a more specific trade secret disclosure list with the magistrate judge. The court expects that these

1 matters will be resolved forthwith. Within ten days after these matters have been resolved, the
2 parties are to meet and confer regarding discovery and to submit either a joint discovery plan or, if
3 the parties are unable to reach agreement, each party's proposed discovery plan.

4 The motion for an order scheduling a Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f) conference and
5 allowing discovery to proceed is otherwise denied without prejudice.

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DATED: 7/21/10



RONALD M. WHYTE
United States District Judge