

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

ABHIJIT PRASAD,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
GAIL SIMMONS, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No.15-cv-04933-BLF (VKD)

**ORDER REJECTING THIRD  
DISCOVERY DISPUTE LETTER FOR  
FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH COURT  
ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 126

On February 5, 2019, the parties submitted a third joint discovery dispute letter concerning matters relating to Mr. Prasad’s deposition. Dkt. No. 126. This joint discovery dispute letter does not comply with the discovery dispute procedures outlined in Court’s Standing Order for Civil Cases in at least two respects.

First, Mr. Prasad’s statement of his position exceeds the 1,500-word limit by 435 words. Second, the parties do not attest to compliance with the requirement that lead counsel for the parties confer about the discovery dispute, and, in fact, the letter suggests that the parties failed to meet and confer at all. Dkt. No. 126 at 1.

The parties may resubmit their dispute to the Court after engaging in a meaningful conference of lead counsel. *See* Standing Order for Civil Cases at 3 (“Unjustified delay or refusal to participate meaningfully in the conference of lead counsel or the preparation of the joint discovery letter may be grounds for entry of an order adverse to the delaying or non-participating party or other appropriate sanctions.”). Any resubmitted joint discovery dispute letter must comply with the Court’s Standing Order for Civil Cases.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

///

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

Dated: February 6, 2019

*Virginia K. DeMarchi*  
VIRGINIA K. DEMARCHI  
United States Magistrate Judge