

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Yanez-Davison v. UPS, Inc.

Yanez-Davison · No. 2:23-cv-3016-DC-AC · Decided July 25, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California denied UPS’s motion for a protective order seeking to stay discovery pending resolution of its motion to dismiss. The court denied the motion without prejudice because UPS failed to comply with the requirement to file a joint discovery statement under Local Rule 251.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Allison Claire
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	July 25, 2025
DOCKET	2:23-cv-3016-DC-AC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant United Parcel Service, Inc. moved for a protective order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c), seeking to stay discovery until resolution of its pending motion to dismiss.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished, nonprecedential district court order

TOPICS

discovery dispute civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure Discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether UPS's motion for a protective order should be considered when the moving party failed to comply with the Local Rule 251(c) requirement to file a joint discovery statement.

HOLDINGS

1. A motion brought under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) must comply with the joint discovery statement requirement in Eastern District of California Local Rule 251(c); because UPS failed to satisfy that requirement, its motion for a protective order was denied without prejudice.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Because UPS, the moving party, did not satisfy Local Rule 251(c)’s joint discovery statement requirement, the motion is denied without prejudice.” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

UPS sought to stay discovery pending resolution of its motion to dismiss. The motion was brought under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) and Eastern District of California Local Rule 251. UPS did not file the joint discovery statement required for discovery motions, and the parties instead filed separate briefs without explanation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was pending in the Eastern District of California. UPS filed a motion for a protective order, and the parties submitted independent briefing rather than the joint discovery statement required by the applicable local rules. The discovery matter was referred to Magistrate Judge Allison Claire, who denied the motion without prejudice.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- U.S. v. Molen, 2012 WL 5940383, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 27, 2012)