

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
9

10 SYDNEY BROOKE ROBERTS and
11 DAVID TYRONE SAMUEL,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

14 SACRAMENTO HOUSING &
15 REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY, et al.,


16 Defendants.

No. 2:22-cv-1699 DJC AC

ORDER

17 This case is before the court on a motion to compel a Rule 26(f) conference. ECF No. 90,
18 opposed at ECF No. 95, reply at ECF No. 27). This discovery motion is referred to the magistrate
19 judge pursuant to E.D. Cal. R. 302(c)(1) and (21). Plaintiffs' motion is DENIED. The
20 conference required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) is not an ongoing obligation. It is instead a one-time
21 requirement to meet and confer regarding a discovery plan. On April 17, 2024, the parties
22 participated in a Pre-Trial Scheduling Conference held before the undersigned, in which
23 scheduling and discovery plans were discussed, and a discovery schedule was issued. ECF Nos.
24 56 and 58. Discovery has been progressing in this case, and non-expert discovery is set to close
25 June 25, 2025. ECF No. 58. Because the Fed. R. 26(f) process is already complete, the plaintiffs'
26 motion (ECF No. 90) is DENIED as MOOT.

27 DATED: May 19, 2025

28

ALLISON CLAIRE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE