

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE APPLE iPHONE ANTITRUST
LITIGATION

Case No. 11-cv-06714-YGR (TSH)

DISCOVERY ORDER

Re: Dkt. No. 212

DONALD R. CAMERON, et al.,

Case No. 19-cv-03074-YGR (TSH)

Plaintiffs,

v.

Re: Dkt. No. 95

APPLE INC.,

Defendant.

The Court has a Discovery Standing Order that bars litigants from filing discovery motions and instead requires them to file a joint discovery letter brief of no more than five pages. This procedure works well for the large majority of discovery disputes, which do not warrant the 65 pages of written briefing otherwise provided for in Civil Local Rule 7. However, some discovery disputes are more complicated, and the Court from time to time excuses compliance with the joint letter brief procedure where it lacks utility. Here, in these related actions, Apple and Samsung have a filed a joint discovery letter brief (ECF No. 212 in the *Pepper* action and ECF No. 95 in the *Cameron* action) where the five-page limit seems not so useful. Given the importance of the issues raised by the subpoena, the number of requests at issue, and the objections to be addressed, full briefing under Local Rule 7 is appropriate. Accordingly, the Court orders Apple to file a full-

1 pledged motion to compel under Rule 7.

2

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4

5 Dated: July 15, 2020

6



THOMAS S. HIXSON
United States Magistrate Judge

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
Northern District of California