

clear that Mazzella's testimony could not possibly have a tendency to incriminate him, and denied the motion.

A Magistrate Judge's non-dispositive order may be set aside if it is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). In this District, when "the magistrate has ruled on a non-dispositive matter such as a discovery motion, his or her ruling is entitled to great deference and is reversible only for abuse of discretion." Kresefsky v. Panasonic Communs. & Sys. Co., 169 F.R.D. 54, 64 (D.N.J. 1996). The burden is on the party filing the appeal to demonstrate that the standard for modifying or setting aside the magistrate judge's ruling has been met. Cardona v. Gen. Motors Corp., 942 F. Supp. 968, 971 (D.N.J. 1996). Plaintiff has not persuaded this Court that the order at issue is clearly erroneous or contrary to law, nor an abuse of discretion.

Plaintiff has not carried its burden of demonstrating that the standard for reversing the Magistrate Judge's decision has been met. This Court agrees with Atalanta that the Magistrate Judge did not abuse her discretion. Moreover, the decision to deny the motion is correct. The Magistrate Judge found that Plaintiff's "own recitation of facts reflects that Mazzella may have allegedly tried, and failed, to defraud Citibank." (Letter Order at 7.) The Magistrate Judge thus correctly determined that it was not perfectly clear that Mazzella's testimony could not possibly have a tendency to incriminate him on charges of conspiracy or attempt to commit wire fraud against a financial institution.

In view of the fact that Plaintiff already deposed Mazzella once, that he repeatedly asserted his Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination in response to all substantive questions, and he has declared his intention to continue to do so, if he is compelled to testify in

this matter, it would be totally pointless to attempt to compel another deposition. There is no reason to believe that the result will be any different.

The Letter Order is not clearly erroneous nor contrary to law, nor did the Magistrate Judge abuse her discretion in entering it. Plaintiff's appeal of Magistrate Judge Waldor's Letter Order, entered October 5, 2021, will be denied, and the Magistrate Judge's decision will be affirmed.

For these reasons,

IT IS on this 9th day of November, 2021

ORDERED that Plaintiff's appeal of the Magistrate Judge's Letter Order entered October 5, 2021 (Docket Entry No. 315) is **DENIED**; and it is further

ORDERED that the Magistrate Judge's Letter Order entered October 5, 2021 (Docket Entry No. 314) is hereby **AFFIRMED**.

s/ Stanley R. Chesler
Stanley R. Chesler, U.S.D.J