

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
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

JOHN P. MARTINO,)
)
 Plaintiff(s),)
)
 v.)
)
 BMO HARRIS BANK, NATIONAL)
 ASSOCIATION, et al.,)
)
 Defendant(s).)

Case No. 2:17-cv-01110-GMN-NJK

ORDER REGARDING RESOLUTION
OF DISCOVERY DISPUTES

Pending before the Court is a discovery plan that includes, *inter alia*, a proposal that discovery disputes be presented to the Court initially in the form of a one-page summary. Docket No. 22 at 6. The Court declines to adopt the procedure proposed. Instead, the Court **ORDERS** as follows:

To the extent the parties are unable to resolve a discovery dispute following an appropriate pre-filing conference¹ and wish to streamline the process for resolving that dispute, they may file a

¹ “Discovery is supposed to proceed with minimal involvement of the Court.” *Cardoza v. Bloomin’ Brands, Inc.*, 141 F. Supp. 3d 1137, 1145 (D. Nev. 2015) (quoting *F.D.I.C. v. Butcher*, 116 F.R.D. 196, 203 (E.D. Tenn. 1986)). Hence, discovery disputes should be presented to the Court only as a last resort and only when the underlying dispute implicates truly significant interests. *See, e.g., id.* (quoting *In re Convergent Techs. Securities Litig.*, 108 F.R.D. 328, 331 (N.D. Cal. 1985)). The pre-filing conference requirement is not a mere technicality, but rather requires counsel to “present to each other the merits of their respect positions with the same candor, specificity, and support during the informal negotiations as during the briefing of discovery motions.” *Nevada Power v. Monsanto*, 151 F.R.D. 118, 120 (D. Nev. 1993); *see also ShuffleMaster, Inc. v. Progressive Games, Inc.*, 170 F.R.D. 166, 171 (D. Nev. 1996). The vast majority of discovery disputes should be resolved through the meet-and-confer process without any Court involvement.

1 stipulation seeking resolution of their dispute. The stipulation shall include a certification detailing the
2 meet-and-confer process, as required by the applicable rules. The joint stipulation shall also include
3 sections outlining each party’s factual and legal contentions regarding each discovery dispute. The
4 parties shall draft their respective portions in a complete manner, citing applicable law and evidence,
5 as if it were a brief in relation to a discovery motion. The page limitations for motions established in
6 the Local Rules will not apply to such a stipulation. *Cf.* C.D. Cal. Local Rule 37-2 (outlining similar
7 procedure for presenting discovery disputes).

8 To the extent the parties do not agree to resolve any particular discovery dispute through the
9 streamlined procedure outlined above, then the discovery dispute shall be presented to the Court through
10 the default procedures in the local rules.²

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 DATED: June 30, 2017

13 
14 _____
15 NANCY J. KOPPE
16 United States Magistrate Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 _____
24 ² Although not entirely clear, the discovery plan appears to envision telephonic resolution of
25 discovery disputes arising during depositions. *See* Docket No. 22 at 6. To be clear, the fact that a dispute
26 arises at a deposition is not, standing alone, grounds to stop the deposition and seek immediate resolution
27 from the Court. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(c)(2) (objections should be stated on the record, “but the examination
28 still proceeds”). Disputes arising a deposition should be presented in writing as outlined herein or by the
default local rules, unless the narrow exceptions to that procedure apply. *Cf.* Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(d)(3)
(requests to terminate or limit a deposition should only be made if the deposition “is being conducted in bad
faith or in a manner that unreasonably annoys, embarrasses, or oppresses the deponent or party”).