

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

- In the Jurisdictional Discovery Order, the court denied Cisco’s request to conduct jurisdictional discovery before filing its response to Defendants’ pending Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. No. 21). The court further ordered Cisco to file its response to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss by June 6, 2013. Cisco has since timely filed its response, without the benefit of jurisdictional discovery. See Dkt. No. 48.
- The Jurisdictional Discovery Order pertained only to Cisco’s request to conduct jurisdictional discovery before the filing of its response to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss. It did not purport to alter the timing and sequence of discovery provided for by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(d) as that issue was not presented as part of that motion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 13, 2013



EDWARD J. DAVILA
United States District Judge