

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Nicholas A. Ventura v. IQVIA Inc., et al.

Ventura · No. 25-cv-09163-RS · Decided January 12, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California denied Plaintiff Nicholas A. Ventura’s motion to compel responses to special interrogatories and his request for sanctions. The court concluded that the interrogatories were not properly served and that discovery was sought before the parties held the required Rule 26(f) conference.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Richard Seeborg
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	January 12, 2026
DOCKET	25-cv-09163-RS
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to compel responses to special interrogatories and requested attorney fees as sanctions.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- service of process
- sanctions
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- discovery

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether Defendants were required to respond to Plaintiff’s special interrogatories when the requests were not properly served under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- Whether Plaintiff could seek discovery before the parties held a qualifying Rule 26(f) conference.
- Whether Plaintiff was entitled to attorney fees as sanctions in connection with the motion to compel.

HOLDINGS

- 1. Because Plaintiff did not properly serve the interrogatories under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 5(b) and 33, Defendants were not obligated to respond.
- 2. Parties may not seek discovery before holding a Rule 26(f) conference, and the conference identified by Defendants did not satisfy that requirement.
- 3. Plaintiff was not entitled to attorney fees as sanctions in connection with the unsuccessful motion to compel.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff claimed that he served special interrogatories on Defendants through the federal court's CM/ECF system on November 2 and 3, 2025. The docket contained no such filing, and the evidence showed that the requests were instead served through the San Francisco Superior Court's electronic case-management system after removal of the action to federal court. Defendants also maintained that the parties' November 25, 2025 conference did not satisfy the required Rule 26(f) conference.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a motion to compel after serving purported discovery requests through an electronic case-management system associated with the San Francisco Superior Court. Defendants opposed the motion, asserting that the interrogatories were not properly served and that discovery was premature because the parties had not completed a qualifying Rule 26(f) conference. The district court denied the motion and sanctions request without oral argument and vacated the scheduled hearing.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Rovio Entertainment Ltd. v. Royal Plush Toys, Inc., 907 F. Supp. 2d 1086, 1099 (N.D. Cal. 2012)

OPINION

Ventura

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9

NICHOLAS A. VENTURA,

10 Case No. 25-cv-09163-RS Plaintiff, 11

v. ORDER DENYING MOTION TO

12 COMPEL DISCOVERY RESPONSES

13 IQVIA INC., et al., 13 Defendants. 14 15 On December 13, 2025, pro se Plaintiff filed a Motion to
Compel Responses to Special 16 Interrogatories. He also seeks attorneys' fees as sanctions.
Plaintiff states that he served a first set 17 of special interrogatories on Defendants "effectuated via
electronic service through the Court's 18 CM/ECF system" on November 2 and 3, 2025. Dkt. 54 at
4; Dkt. 55, Declaration of Nicholas A. 19 Ventura, ¶ 3. However, there is no such filing on this
court's docket, and all four Defendants assert 20 they were not properly served. Dkt. 67 at 3-4;
Dkt. 69 at 6. Rather, Exhibit A to Plaintiff's Motion 21 to Compel shows the discovery requests
were served via the electronic case management system 22 for the San Francisco Superior Court
more than a week after the case was removed to federal 23 court. Dkt. 54, Ex. A. Since the
interrogatories were not properly served, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b), 24 33, Defendants are not
obligated to respond. Moreover, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25 26(d)(1), parties may
not seek discovery before holding a Rule 26(f) conference. See Rovio 26 Entertainment Ltd. v.
Royal Plush Toys, Inc., 907 F.Supp.2d 1086, 1099 (N.D. Cal. 2012). 27 Defendants represent that
the conference the parties had on November 25, 2025 did not meet the 1 3. Accordingly, Plaintiff's
motion to compel and request for sanctions are denied.! 2 3 || ITISSO ORDERED. 4 5 Dated:
January 12, 2026 # 6

RICHARD SEEBORG

7 Chief United States District Judge 8 9 10 11 12 15 16 it 4 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 Pursuant to
Civil Local Rule 7-1(b), the motion is suitable for disposition without oral argument, 27 and the
hearing set for January 29, 2026 is vacated.

28 << SHORT ORDER TITLE >>

CASE No. 25-cv-09163-RS