

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

ISMAEL JIMENEZ, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
DAVID Y TSAI, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. [5:16-cv-04434-EJD](#) (HRL)

**ORDER RE SUPPLEMENTAL  
DISCOVERY DISPUTE JOINT  
REPORT NO. 2**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 94, 95


The outcome of a previous discovery dispute was an order by the presiding judge that defendants were allowed 15 depositions, 5 more than what Fed. R. Civ. P. 30 provides as the usual maximum. The presiding judge tasked this court to deal with any request for even more depositions from defendants. This court ordered: “If defendants want more, they should bring their request to this court in accordance with its Standing Order on Civil Discovery Disputes.” (Dkt. 73). Ultimately, the defendants took the 15 allowed depositions and then, in a filing styled “Supplemental Discovery Dispute Report No. 2,” asked this court for 4 more depositions. (Dkt. 94).

For the reasons set out in plaintiff’s “Objections and Opposition to Defendants’ Supplemental Discovery Dispute Report No. 2,” defendants’ request for further depositions is

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

denied. SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 6, 2017



---

HOWARD R. LLOYD  
United States Magistrate Judge