

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SYDNEY BROOKE ROBERTS and
DAVID TYRONE SAMUEL,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SACRAMENTO HOUSING AND
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:22-cv-1699 DJC AC PS

ORDER

Pending before the court is plaintiff’s motion to compel. ECF No. 66. Plaintiffs are proceeding in pro se, and this discovery motion is referred to the undersigned pursuant to E.D. Cal. R. (“Local Rule”) 302(c)(1) and (21).

Local Rule 251(b) requires that the parties meet and confer prior to filing a motion to compel discovery. The Standing Orders of the undersigned U.S. Magistrate Judge provide that “[w]ritten correspondence between the parties, including email, is insufficient to satisfy the parties’ meet and confer obligations under Local Rule 251(b). Prior to the filing of a Joint Statement, the parties must confer in person or via telephone or video conferencing in an attempt to resolve the dispute.” See [https://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/assets/File/Judge Claire Standing Orders \(updated March 2023\).pdf](https://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/assets/File/Judge%20Claire%20Standing%20Orders%20(updated%20March%202023).pdf).


1 Here, plaintiffs' motion states that they have requested documents in discovery "on seven
2 occasions" but there is no indication that formal discovery requests have been served or that the
3 parties have properly met and conferred regarding the instant dispute. ECF No. 66. Defendants
4 contend that they have not been served with any discovery requests, and that plaintiffs have not
5 attempted to discuss discovery with them by phone or even email. ECF No. 72 at 3.

6 Because plaintiffs did not attach or identify any specific discovery requests to their
7 motion, the court cannot identify any discovery to compel. Further, because plaintiffs, the
8 moving party, did not satisfy Local Rule 251(b)'s meet and confer requirement, the motion to
9 compel discovery will be denied. See e.g., U.S. v. Molen, 2012 WL 5940383, at *1 (E.D.Cal.
10 Nov. 27, 2012) (where a party fails to comply with Local Rule 251, discovery motions are denied
11 without prejudice to re-filing). If plaintiffs wish to serve subsequent discovery motions, they
12 must identify the specific discovery requests they seek to compel, they must satisfy meet and
13 confer requirements by attempting to resolve their discovery disputes with defendants. Further,
14 they must follow all of the procedural requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and
15 the Local Rules of this Court.

16 For the reasons stated above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion to
17 compel, ECF No. 66, is DENIED.

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DATE: December 30, 2024

20 
21 ALLISON CLAIRE
22 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
23
24
25
26
27
28