

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
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

<p>CRYTEK GMBH,</p> <p style="padding-left: 150px;">Plaintiff,</p> <p style="padding-left: 100px;">v.</p> <p>CLOUD IMPERIUM GAMES CORP. AND ROBERTS SPACE INDUSTRIES CORP.,</p> <p style="padding-left: 150px;">Defendants.</p>	}	<p>No. CV 17-8937 DMG (FFMx)</p> <p>ORDER ON SUBMITTED MATTER</p>
---	---	---

On March 12, 2018, defendants filed a motion for an order controlling the timing and scope of discovery. (*See* Dkt. No. 30.) Specifically, defendants request a stay of discovery proceedings pending the disposition of defendants’ pending motion to dismiss the First Amended Complaint. Plaintiff filed an opposition on March 27, 2018. Defendants thereafter filed a reply.

On April 17, 2018, the Court announced a tentative ruling to deny the motion and then entertained oral argument. At the conclusion of the argument, the Court took the matter under submission. Upon further review, the Court notes that Judge Gee issued an Initial Standing Order on December 13, 2017. Paragraph 4.b. of that order addresses discovery before and after the scheduling conference. Specifically, the order provides that “it is advisable for counsel to begin to conduct discovery actively before the Scheduling

1 Conference.” Although early discovery is strongly encouraged, Judge Gee’s policy is not
2 to require the parties to participate in discovery until a scheduling order has issued. As
3 no scheduling order has been issued in this case as of now, defendants are not required to
4 respond to discovery at this time. The motion for stay, therefore, is moot and denied on
5 that basis.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8
9 DATED: April 17, 2018

10
11 /S/ Frederick F. Mumm
12 FREDERICK F. MUMM
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

14 cc: The Honorable Dolly Gee
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28