

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: October 16, 2012

NOT FOR CITATION
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

SOLADIGM, INC.,
Plaintiff,
v.
MIN MING TARNG,
Defendant.

No. C11-05416 EJD (HRL)
**ORDER RE PARTIES' DISCOVERY
MOTIONS**
[Re: Dkt. Nos. 106, 111, 126]

Pro se defendant Min Ming Tarnng has filed a "Motion for Stopping Bad Faith Deposition in Unreasonable Manner to Annoy, Embarrass and Oppress the Defendant." (Dkt. No. 106). Essentially, Tarnng seeks a protective order preventing plaintiff Soladigm, Inc. (Soladigm) from taking his deposition. For its part, Soladigm has filed a motion to compel Tarnng to appear for deposition and to produce certain documents. (Dkt. No. 111). Upon consideration of the moving papers, as well as the discussion held at the October 16, 2012 hearing, this court rules as follows:

1. Soladigm is entitled to depose Tarnng, and Tarnng shall appear for his deposition on October 25, 2012, 9:30 a.m.. Unless otherwise stipulated or ordered by the court, Tarnng's deposition shall last no more than 7 hours (not including breaks). FED. R. CIV. P. 30(d). The parties advise that they currently are meeting and conferring about having the deposition proceed in San Jose or possibly some other location. Failing agreement, Tarnng shall appear for

1 his deposition, as noticed, in San Francisco: Farella Braun + Martel, 235 Montgomery Street,
2 17th Floor.


3 2. Soladigm is entitled to complete copies of all documents Tarnge referenced or
4 quoted in his discovery responses. There is no indication that the documents are privileged or
5 otherwise subject to protection from discovery. Tarnge shall produce complete copies of all such
6 documents by **October 22, 2012**.

7 3. The parties are reminded of their obligation to meet-and-confer with one another
8 in good faith about all matters in this litigation generally—and especially before bringing
9 discovery disputes to the court’s attention. Indeed, the court will not entertain any discovery
10 matters, unless the parties have previously conferred for the purpose of attempting to resolve all
11 disputed issues. See Civ. L.R. 37-1(a); see also this court’s Standing Order re Civil Discovery
12 Disputes, Section 2.

13 4. Any other pending discovery motions, including the one filed by defendant on
14 October 11, 2012 (Dkt. No. 126), will be terminated and the noticed hearings will be vacated.
15 The parties shall instead comply with the undersigned’s Standing Order re Civil Discovery
16 Disputes.

17 SO ORDERED.

18 Dated: October 16, 2012

19 
20 _____
21 HOWARD R. LLOYD
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 5:11-cv-05416-EJD Notice has been electronically mailed to:
2 Christoffer Lee clee@fbm.com
3 Erik Christopher Olson eolson@fbm.com, DGracia@fbm.com
4 Jessica Koren Nall jnall@fbm.com, bheuss@fbm.com, calendar@fbm.com
5 Robert John Artuz rartuz@kilpatricktownsend.com, amorjig@kilpatricktownsend.com
6 Roderick Manley Thompson rthompson@fbm.com, adugan@fbm.com, calendar@fbm.com

7
8 5:11-cv-05416-EJD Notice sent by U.S. Mail to:

9 Min Ming Tarn, Ph.D
10 1367 Glenmoor Way
11 San Jose, CA 95129

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28