1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
9		
10	MARK SMITH,	CASE NO. C18-0701JLR
11	Plaintiff, v.	ORDER STRIKING DISCOVERY MOTION
12		
13	EVERGREEN TREATMENT SERVICES,	
14	Defendant.	
15	Before the court is Defendant Evergreen Treatment Services's ("Evergreen")	
16		
17	motion to compel Plaintiff Mark Smith's responses to discovery. (Mot. (Dkt. # 28).)	
18	Evergreen filed that motion without first requesting a conference with the court. (See	
19	Dkt.) The motion therefore contravenes the court's December 12, 2018, scheduling	
20	order. (See Sched. Order (Dkt. # 25) at 2 (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(3)(B)(v))	
21	("[P]ursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16, the Court 'direct[s] that before	
22	moving for an order relating to discovery, the moving for all the moving for the following for the moving for the moving for the following for the moving for the following following for the following for the following following for the following	ovant must request a conference with the

court' by notifying [the courtroom deputy] . . . ." (second alteration in original))); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(3)(B)(v) (permitting the court, in its scheduling order, to "direct that before moving for an order relating to discovery, the movant must request a conference with the court"). The court therefore STRIKES Evergreen's motion to compel discovery (Dkt. #28) without prejudice to renewing the motion in a manner that comports with the court's scheduling order. Dated this 10th day of July, 2019. ~ R. Rlit JAMES L. ROBART United States District Judge