

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

OPINION

Yanez-Davison v. UPS, Inc.

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 CHRISTINA YANEZ-DAVISON, No. 2:23-cv-3016-DC-AC

12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER

14 UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INC.,

JOSEPH DALIA, and DOES 1-10, 15 inclusive, 16 Defendants. 17 18 19 Pending before the court is defendant United Parcel Service (UPS)'s motion for a 20 protective order seeking to stay discovery until the resolution of its pending motion to dismiss 21 (ECF No. 33). ECF No. 39. The motion is brought pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) and Local

22 Rule 251. ECF No. 39 at 1. This discovery matter was referred to the undersigned pursuant to 23 E.D. Cal. R. ("Local Rule") 302(c)(1). 24 Local Rules 251(b) and (c) establish requirements for any party bringing a motion 25 pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 through 37 and 45, including the requirement that 26 the parties file a joint discovery statement. Here, no joint discovery statement has been filed; the 27 parties instead filed independent briefing without explanation or reference to the joint statement 28 requirement. ECF Nos. 39, 41, 44. Because UPS, the moving party, did not satisfy Local Rule 1 |} 251(c)'s joint discovery statement requirement, the motion is denied without prejudice. See e.g., 2 | US. v. Molen, 2012 WL 5940383, at *1 (E.D.Cal. Nov. 27, 2012) (where a party fails to comply 3 || with Local Rule 251, discovery motions are denied without prejudice to re-filing). 4 For the reasons state above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that defendant's motion for a 5 || protective order, ECF No. 39, is DENIED without prejudice. 6 IT IS SO ORDERED. 7 | DATE: July 25, 2025 Af

8 ALLISON CLAIRE

9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10 1] 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28