

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

SIDNEY GORDON AND JEFFREY  
TAUBER,  
  
                    Plaintiffs,  
  
          v.  
  
SIGMA DESIGNS, INC.,  
  
                    Defendant.

Case No. [15-mc-80057-NC](#)

**TENTATIVE RULING ON MOTION  
TO COMPEL**

Re: Dkt. No. 1

Petitioners Sidney Gordon and Jeffrey Tauber move to compel the production of documents subpoenaed from non-party Sigma under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45. A hearing on this matter is scheduled for tomorrow afternoon in front of this Court.

A party issuing a subpoena “must take reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden or expense on a person subject to the subpoena.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(d)(1). Moreover, the Court must limit discovery if it determines that the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(C).

Here, the Court’s tentative view is to deny petitioners’ motion to compel because petitioners have not taken reasonable steps to avoid imposing undue burden, and have not established the proportionality of their requests. See *Nalco Co. v. Turner Designs, Inc.*, No. 13-cv-02727 NC, 2014 WL 1311571, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 31, 2014) (denying motion to compel because subpoenaing party failed to take reasonable steps to avoid imposing  
Case No.: [15-mc-80057-NC](#)

1 undue burden) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(d)(1)); see also In re NCAA Student-Athlete Name  
2 & Likeness Licensing Litig., No. 09-cv-01967 CW (NC), 2012 WL 629225, at \*1 (N.D.  
3 Cal. Feb. 27, 2012) (“[B]ecause antitrust plaintiffs did not make reasonable attempts to  
4 avoid imposing an undue burden on the nonparties, sanctions against antitrust plaintiffs are  
5 warranted under Rule 45.”); Convolv, Inc. v. Dell, Inc., No. 10-cv-80071 WHA, 2011 WL  
6 1766486, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. May 9, 2011) (quashing subpoena and noting exhaustive  
7 definitions to words such as “documents” and “identify” serve to further broaden the scope  
8 of the subpoena unnecessarily).

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10 Dated: February 24, 2015

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
NATHANAEL M. COUSINS  
United States Magistrate Judge

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28