

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

|                                  |  |   |                                       |
|----------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| <hr/>                            |  | : |                                       |
| <b>SHARONDA DAVIS, ET AL.,</b>   |  | : |                                       |
|                                  |  | : |                                       |
| <b>Plaintiffs,</b>               |  | : | <b>Civil Action No. 11-1155 (KSH)</b> |
|                                  |  | : |                                       |
| <b>v.</b>                        |  | : |                                       |
|                                  |  | : |                                       |
| <b>CITY OF PATERSON, ET AL.,</b> |  | : | <b>ORDER ON INFORMAL</b>              |
|                                  |  | : | <b>APPLICATION</b>                    |
| <b>Defendants.</b>               |  | : |                                       |
| <hr/>                            |  | : |                                       |

This matter having come before the Court by way of letter dated January 13, 2012, regarding certain discovery disputes that the plaintiff seeks to have resolved;

and the Court having entered Orders dated July 28, 2011, October 19, 2011, and December 15, 2011 that specifically set forth the format in which the parties are required to raise discovery disputes;<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court set forth a specific format for raising discovery disputes that requires the parties to both confer and work together in good faith to resolve and present discovery disputes. The required format assists the Court to efficiently resolve the disputes and ensures that the necessary information is presented in a concise fashion. The Order requires that

Counsel shall confer in a good faith attempt to informally resolve any and all discovery disputes before seeking the Court’s intervention. Should such informal effort fail to resolve the dispute, the matter shall be brought to the Court’s attention via a joint letter that sets forth: (a) the request, (b) the response; (c) efforts to resolve the dispute; (d) why the complaining party believes the information is relevant and why the responding party’s response continues to be deficient; and (e) why the responding party believes the response is sufficient. No further submissions regarding the dispute may be submitted without leave of Court. If necessary, the Court will thereafter schedule a telephone conference to resolve the dispute.

(Pretr. Sched. Order, July 28, 2011, ECF No. 18; Am. Pretr. Sched. Order, Oct. 19, 2011, ECF No. 22; 2d Am. Pretr. Sched. Order, Dec. 15, 2011, ECF No. 29.)

and it appearing that the January 13, 2012 letter was not submitted in the format required for raising discovery disputes;

and for the reasons set forth herein;

IT IS ON THIS 17th day of January, 2012

ORDERED that the request for relief embodied in the plaintiff's letter dated January 13, 2012 is denied without prejudice; and

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the discovery disputes raised in the letter dated January 13, 2012 shall be presented, no later than **January 26, 2012** via the joint letter protocol.

s/Patty Shwartz  
**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**