1		
1 2		
2		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	CARL ZEISS VISION INTERNATIONAL GMBH and CARL ZEISS VISION INC.,,	CASE NO. 07cv0894 DMS (POR)
12	Plaintiffs,	ORDER OVERRULING PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO
13	vs.	DECEMBER 1, 2009 DISCOVERY ORDER
14	SIGNET ARMORLITE, INC.,	
15	Defendant.	
16 17	AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	
17	AND ALL KELATED COUNTERCLAINS.	
10 19	This case comes before the Court on Pla	intiffs' objections to Magistrate Judge Louisa S.
20	Porter's December 1, 2009 Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Joint Discovery Motion.	
21	Defendant filed a response to Plaintiffs' objections. Plaintiffs did not file a reply.	
22	A magistrate judge's decision on a nondispositive issue is reviewed by the district court under	
23	the "clearly erroneous or contrary to law" standard. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); United States v.	
24	Raddatz, 447 U.S. 667, 673 (1980); Bhan v. NME Hospitals, Inc., 929 F.2d 1404, 1414 (9th Cir. 1991).	
25	"A finding is 'clearly erroneous' when although there is evidence to support it, the reviewing court	
26	on the entire record is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed."	
27	United States v. United States Gypsum Co., 333 U.S. 364, 395 (1948). In contrast, the "contrary to	
28	law" standard permits independent review of pure	ely legal determinations by a magistrate judge. See

07cv0894

1	e.g., Haines v. Liggetts Group, Inc., 975 F.2d 81, 91 (3d Cir. 1992); Medical Imaging Centers of	
2	America, Inc. v. Lichtenstein, 917 F.Supp. 717, 719 (S.D. Cal. 1996). Thus, the district court should	
3	exercise its independent judgment with respect to a magistrate judge's legal conclusions. Gandee v.	
4	Glaser, 785 F.Supp. 684, 686 (S.D. Ohio 1992).	
5	Plaintiffs' objections to the Magistrate Judge's Order do not establish that the Magistrate	
6	Judge's rulings were either clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court overrules	
7	Plaintiffs' objections to the Magistrate Judge's Order.	
8	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
9	DATED: February 12, 2010	
10	John m. Salom	
11	HON. DANA M. SABRAW United States District Judge	
12	United States District Judge	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		