

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6

7 NEWMARK REALTY CAPITAL, INC.,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 BGC PARTNERS, INC., et al.,

11 Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-01702-BLF (SVK)

**ORDER ON CORRECTED JOINT
STATEMENT ON PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER
ON DEFENDANTS' SECOND SET OF
REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION (NOS.
164-255)**

Re: Dkt. No. 337

12 On the Corrected Joint Statement on Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order on
13 Defendants' Second Set of Requests for Admissions (ECF 337), the Court ORDERS as follows:

- 14
- 15 • Plaintiff is not required to further respond to the existing Second Set of RFAs (Nos.
16 164-255).¹ No later than **noon on May 8, 2018**, Defendants may re-serve a
17 reduced set of RFAs. From among the RFAs included in Defendants' Second Set
18 of RFAs, Defendants may select (1) up to 25 substantive RFAs and (2) an
19 unlimited number of RFAs asking Plaintiff to admit or deny the genuineness of any
20 complete document (not portions of documents).
 - 21 • Plaintiff must serve responses to the reduced set of RFAs, consisting of answers
22 and/or objections, no later than **5:00 p.m. on May 9, 2018**.
 - 23 • If there are any disputes about the sufficiency of Plaintiff's responses, the parties
24 must submit a jointly-prepared chart by **noon on May 10, 2018**. The chart must
25 contain columns for RFA, response, Defendant's position, proposed compromises,
26 and a blank column for the Court's order. The chart must be filed on ECF and

27
28 ¹ The Court has received Plaintiff's responses to the Second Set of RFAs, which were served on
May 7, 2018 and submitted by Defendants to the Court this morning. Despite Plaintiff's service
of responses, the parties are to proceed as set forth in this Order.

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

submitted in Word format to svkpo@cand.uscourts.gov. The Court will inform the parties if a hearing is required; if so, it will be held telephonically at **3:00 p.m. on May 10, 2018.**

In preparing Defendants' revised set of RFAs and Plaintiff's responses, the parties are directed to consider the proper function of RFAs, as set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 36, as well as the Court's previous rulings on the parties' RFA disputes.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 7, 2018



SUSAN VAN KEULEN
United States Magistrate Judge