

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10  
11 WILLIAM BECKMAN AND LINDA GANDARA,  
12 individuals, on behalf of themselves, and all  
13 persons similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 ARIZONA CANNING COMPANY, LLC AND  
16 DOES 1-10

17 Defendants.

Case No.: 16cv2792-JAH(BLM)

**ORDER GRANTING APPLICATION FOR  
EXTENSION OF TIME FOR  
PRESENTATION OF DISPUTES AND  
PERMISSION TO SATISFY MEET AND  
CONFER EFFORTS BY TELEPHONE**

**[ ECF No. 52 ]**

18  
19 On April 15, 2020, Defendant filed an Application for Extension of Time for Presentation  
20 of Disputes Regarding Plaintiff's Discovery Responses and Permission to Satisfy Meet and Confer  
21 Requirements by Telephone. ECF No. 52. Defendant seeks modification of Judge Major's  
22 Chambers Rule V(A) requiring counsel to meet and confer in person if they are in the same  
23 county. Id. at 4. In support, Defendant states that the current COVID-19 pandemic has  
24 impacted counsels' ability "to conduct a prompt and in-person meet and confer." Id. at 4.  
25 Defendant also seeks to continue the deadlines for bringing a motion to compel responses to  
26 Defendant's written discovery and supplementation of Plaintiffs' Rule 26(e) disclosures to May  
27 12, 2020. Id. In support, Defendant states that it has not received any discovery responses  
28 from Plaintiff Gandara and that such responses were due to be served on March 30, 2020. Id.

1 at 2. Defendant further states that there is a dispute regarding this deadline.<sup>1</sup> Id. at n1.  
2 Defendant also states that it received Plaintiff Beckman's responses to Defendant's written  
3 discovery on March 27, 2020, identified numerous deficiencies, spoke with Plaintiffs' counsel on  
4 April 9, 2020, and followed up with a letter to Plaintiffs' counsel on April 10, 2020, but that the  
5 parties need additional time to meet and confer before initiating a dispute call with chambers.  
6 Id. at 2-3. Finally, Defendant states that "the parties continue to have a dispute over Plaintiffs'  
7 Rule 26(e) Disclosures." Id. at 3-4.

8 Good cause appearing, Defendant's motion is **GRANTED** as follows:

- 9 1. Counsel for the parties may satisfy the meet and confer requirements of Chambers  
10 Rule V(A) telephonically.
- 11 2. Defendant's deadline to bring a discovery dispute related to Plaintiff's Rule 26(a)  
12 disclosures and Rule 26(e) obligations is continued to **May 12, 2020**.
- 13 3. Defendant's deadline to bring a discovery dispute related to Plaintiff Beckman's March  
14 25, 2020 discovery responses is continued to **May 12, 2020**.
- 15 4. Defendant's deadline to bring a discovery dispute related to Plaintiff Gandara's not-  
16 yet-served discovery responses is continued to **May 12, 2020**.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 Dated: 4/17/2020

  
19 Hon. Barbara L. Major  
20 United States Magistrate Judge  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

---

26 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff Gandara believed that Defendant extended the time for her to respond three times to  
27 April 30, 2020, however, it is Defendant's position that it only granted two extensions of time  
28 and the responses were due on March 30, 2020. ECF No. 52 at n.1.