

1 **** E-filed February 28, 2011 ****

2
3
4
5
6
7 NOT FOR CITATION
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10 SAN JOSE DIVISION

11 THOMAS SPILSBURY,

No. C09-05955 JW (HRL)

12 Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE THE PARTIES'
RESPECTIVE DISCOVERY
MOTIONS**

13 v.

14 TARGET CORP., et al.,

[Re: Docket Nos. 95, 99, 103, 112, 115]

15 Defendants.
16 _____/

17 Over the past two months, this case has been haphazardly pursued. Essential facts have
18 changed, and motions have been made and withdrawn.

19 Now, the parties have deluged this Court with discovery motions. On February 8, 2011,
20 Defendants' filed a motion to compel the release of Plaintiff's Facebook information. Docket No.
21 95. And from February 9 to February 15, Plaintiff filed three motions to compel and a motion to
22 quash. Docket Nos. 99, 103, 112, 115.

23 However, per Judge Ware's scheduling order — which he recently refused to modify —
24 discovery closed on January 21, 2011 (Docket No. 36), and under this District's civil local rules,
25 discovery motions may not be filed more than seven days after the discovery cutoff. See Civ. L.R.
26 37-3. Knowing this, both parties filed administrative motions for leave to file these discovery
27 motions (although they filed the underlying motions anyway).
28

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

It is Judge Ware, and not this Court, who decides whether to extend the discovery cutoff and whether to allow parties to conduct discovery after it. Thus, this Court refers the parties' administrative motions to Judge Ware. See Docket Nos. 101, 102. Further, since the parties' discovery motions were filed more than seven days after the current January 21 discovery cutoff, this Court DENIES them without prejudice. See Docket Nos. 95, 99, 103, 112, 115. Should Judge Ware extend the discovery cutoff or allow the parties to move to compel, the parties may refile their motions and notice them for hearing before this Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 28, 2011



HOWARD R. LLOYD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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

C09-05955 JW (HRL) Notice will be electronically mailed to:

Juliet MacMillin Lompa jmlompa@stonelawoffice.com, csepulveda@stonelawoffice.com
Timothy Dennis McMahon tmcMahon@cmalaw.net, jefflochner@gmail.com,
rosario@cmalaw.net

Please see General Order 45 Section IX C.2 and D; Notice has NOT been electronically mailed to:

Colette Stone
Stone & Sidran
A Professional Coporation
2125 Ygnacio Valley Road
Suite 101
Walnut Creek, CA 94598

Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel who have not registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.