

United States District Court
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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

NETAPP, INC.,
Plaintiff,

v.

NIMBLE STORAGE, INC., MICHAEL
REYNOLDS, an individual, DANIEL
WEBER, an individual, SANDHYA
KLUTE, an individual, TIMOTHY
BINNING, an individual, NEIL GLICK, an
individual, CHRISTOPHER ALDUINO, an
individual, and Does 1-50,
Defendants.

Case No. 5:13-cv-05058 HRL

**ORDER RE DISCOVERY DISPUTE
JOINT REPORT NO. 1**

[Re: Dkt. No. 43]

In Discovery Dispute Joint Report (DDJR) No. 1, plaintiff requests leave to conduct jurisdictional discovery in connection with defendants' pending motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, and the parties apparently dispute the scope of discovery that properly may be taken at this stage of the litigation. Defendants maintain that this is a decision that properly rests with the presiding judge, arguing that there is no basis for general jurisdiction and that, any discovery must be limited to specific jurisdiction. The docket indicates that the parties stipulated that plaintiff's renewed motion for leave to conduct jurisdictional discovery could be set for hearing before Judge Koh on May 8, 2014. (Dkt. No. 39). Whether or not jurisdictional discovery should be allowed is a threshold question for the presiding judge to determine in the first instance.

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

There is no indication that Judge Koh has determined that jurisdictional discovery is necessary or appropriate to resolve defendants' pending motion, and she has not referred that particular question to the undersigned. Accordingly, the DDJR is denied, subject to whatever decision Judge Koh may make on that issue.¹

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 6, 2014



HOWARD R. LOYD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ If Judge Koh allows jurisdictional discovery and defines its permissible scope, then any disputes over the requests that are propounded properly would be brought before this court.

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

5:13-cv-05058-LHK Notice has been electronically mailed to:

David T. Xue dtxue@duanemorris.com

Grace Y. Park gpark@be-law.com, sbrill@be-law.com

Jaideep Venkatesan jvenkatesan@be-law.com, jnewman@be-law.com

Karineh Khachatourian kkhachatourian@duanemorris.com, afdreyfuss@duanemorris.com,
cpherrera@duanemorris.com, ktrevisan@duanemorris.com

Patrick Eugene Premo ppremo@fenwick.com, ssanford@fenwick.com

Patrick Shaw Salceda psalceda@duanemorris.com