

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

CASCADE YARNS, Inc., A Washington  
corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

KNITTING FEVER, INC., a New York  
corporation, et al.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C10-861RSM

ORDER ON RE-NOTING OF  
MOTIONS TO COMPEL

The Court, having considered plaintiff’s two “re-notice” filings (Dkt. ## 334, 335),  
purporting to re-note previous motions to compel, does now find and ORDER:

(1) On July 12, 2011, the Court struck three motions to compel filed by plaintiff,  
finding that they were premature in light of defendants’ request that a protective order be in place  
before discovery commenced. Dkt. # 323. Plaintiff’s notices purport to re-note two of these  
stricken motions for the Court’s consideration. Dkt. ## 239, 293.

(2) The motions to compel were not stricken with leave to renew. Plaintiff’s attempt to

1 re- note these motions without further briefing, and without certification of a good faith effort to  
 2 meet and confer, evades the letter and spirit of Rule 37(a)(1). It also complicates the Court’s  
 3 task of ruling on the motion, as the “re-notices” do not clearly indicate what remains at issue.  
 4 Further, the noting dates provided by plaintiff, namely May 27, 2011 and July 8, 2011, are long  
 5 past and deprive defendants of an opportunity to respond.

6 (3) The Court accordingly declines to place these “re-notices” on the motion calendar for  
 7 consideration. Plaintiff may only file these as new motions to compel, following a Local Rule 37  
 8 conference in an attempt to resolve the issues without Court action.

9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24

Dated August 30, 2011.

  
 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE