

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**

LEADERSHIP STUDIES, INC., a
California corporation,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BLANCHARD TRAINING AND
DEVELOPMENT, INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 15-cv-1831-WQH (KSC)

ORDER

HAYES, Judge:

The matter before the Court is the review of the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 174) issued by the United States Magistrate Judge.

Background

On April 27, 2018, the United States Magistrate Judge issued the Report and Recommendation, recommending that this Court deny the request by Plaintiff Leadership Studies for an order imposing discovery sanctions against Defendant Blanchard Training and Development by excluding the expert report and expert testimony of Hal Poret. (ECF No. 174).

On May 11, 2018, Plaintiff filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. (ECF No. 190).

On May 18, 2018, Defendant filed a response to the objections. (ECF No. 195).

1 **Legal Standard**

2 The duties of the district court in connection with a report and recommendation
3 of a magistrate judge are set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) and 28
4 U.S.C. § 636(b). The district judge must “make a de novo determination of those
5 portions of the report ... to which objection is made,” and “may accept, reject, or
6 modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.”
7 28 U.S.C. § 636(b).


8 **Ruling of the Court**

9 After conducting a *de novo* review of the Report and Recommendation and
10 considering the objections filed by Plaintiff Leadership Studies, the Court finds that the
11 Magistrate Judge correctly determined that the request for an order excluding the expert
12 report and expert testimony of Hal Poret should be denied. The Court adopts the Report
13 and Recommendation in its entirety.

14 **Conclusion**

15 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No.
16 174) is adopted in its entirety. The Joint motion for Determination of Discovery dispute
17 (ECF No. 141) is granted and Plaintiff’s request for an order imposing discovery
18 sanctions against Defendant by excluding the expert report and expert testimony of Hal
19 Poret is denied.

20 DATED: August 7, 2018

21 
22 **WILLIAM Q. HAYES**
23 United States District Judge

24
25
26
27
28