

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
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

PACIFIC LAW CENTER, a Professional
Law Corporation; and SOLOMON WARD
SEIDENWURM & SMITH, LLP,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

SHAHROKH SAADAT-NEJAD, an
individual,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 07cv460 JLS (POR)

**ORDER: DENYING
DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR
"WRIT OF MANDAMUS"**

On April 8, 2008, Defendant filed a document entitled "writ of mandamus." On page 37 of that document, Defendant requests that the Court: (1) order Plaintiffs to provide him a copy of his August 3, 2006 retainer with Pacific Law Center, and (2) send the federal "court file" to Judge Richard Strauss who is presiding over the parallel state court case against Defendant.


The Court finds Defendant's first request premature because he has failed to show that Plaintiffs have failed to comply with any particular discovery request under Rule 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(3)(B) (stating that a party may move for an order compelling production if another party fails to respond or fails to permit inspection); see also LR 26.1(a) ("The court shall entertain no motion pursuant to Rules 26 through 37, Fed. R. Civ. P., unless counsel shall have previously met and conferred concerning all disputed issues."). Therefore, the Court **DENIES** Defendant's first request.

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

The Court also **DENIES** Defendant's second request because there is no legal basis for it. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Defendant's motion for a "writ of mandamus."

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 9, 2008



Honorable Janis L. Sammartino
United States District Judge