1		
2		
2		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	CARL ZEISS VISION INTERNATIONAL	CASE NO. 07cv0894 DMS (POR)
12	GMBH and CARL ZEISS VISION INC.,,	ORDER OVERRULING
13	Plaintiffs, vs.	DEFENDANT'S OBJECTIONS TO DECEMBER 1, 2009 DISCOVERY
14		ORDER
15	SIGNET ARMORLITE, INC., Defendant.	
16	Derendant.	
17	AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.	
18		
19	This case comes before the Court on Defendant's objection to Magistrate Judge Louisa S.	
20	Porter's December 1, 2009 Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Joint Discovery Motion.	
21	Plaintiffs filed an opposition to Defendant's objection. Defendant filed an ex parte application to file	
22	a response to Plaintiffs' opposition, and Plaintiffs filed an opposition thereto. After reviewing these	
23	briefs, the Court overrules Defendant's objection, and denies Defendant's ex parte application to file	
24	a responsive brief.	
25	A magistrate judge's decision on a nondispositive issue is reviewed by the district court under	
26	the "clearly erroneous or contrary to law" standard. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); United States v.	
27	Raddatz, 447 U.S. 667, 673 (1980); Bhan v. NME Hospitals, Inc., 929 F.2d 1404, 1414 (9th Cir. 1991)	

28 "A finding is 'clearly erroneous' when although there is evidence to support it, the reviewing court

07cv0894

1	on the entire record is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed."	
2	United States v. United States Gypsum Co., 333 U.S. 364, 395 (1948). In contrast, the "contrary to	
3	law" standard permits independent review of purely legal determinations by a magistrate judge. See	
4	e.g., Haines v. Liggetts Group, Inc., 975 F.2d 81, 91 (3d Cir. 1992); Medical Imaging Centers of	
5	America, Inc. v. Lichtenstein, 917 F.Supp. 717, 719 (S.D. Cal. 1996). Thus, the district court should	
6	exercise its independent judgment with respect to a magistrate judge's legal conclusions. Gandee v.	
7	Glaser, 785 F.Supp. 684, 686 (S.D. Ohio 1992).	
8	Defendant's objection to the Magistrate Judge's Order does not establish that the Magistrate	
9	Judge's rulings were either clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court overrules	
10	Defendant's objection to the Magistrate Judge's Order.	
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
12	DATED: February 16, 2010	
13	Ann m. Solom	
14	HON. DANA M. SABRAW United States District Judge	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23 24		
24 25		
23 26		
20 27		
27		
20		