

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

JERI CONNOR,
Plaintiff,

v.

QUORA, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. 18-cv-07597-BLF

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RELIEF FROM NONDISPOSITIVE
PRETRIAL ORDER OF MAGISTRATE
JUDGE**

[Re: ECF 237]

United States District Court
Northern District of California

Before the Court is Defendant Quora, Inc.’s motion for relief from a non-dispositive pretrial order of Magistrate Judge Nathanael M. Cousins, pursuant to Local Civil Rule 72-2. *See* Mot., ECF 237. Quora challenges Judge Cousins’s denial of its motion to compel a forensic examination of Plaintiff Jeri Connor’s electronic devices she used to access Quora on the bases that the decision was clearly erroneous and contrary to law. *Id.* 2. Quora argues that it addressed all the details Judge Cousins found lacking in its proposal and that his alleged lack of reasoning for the decision makes it contrary to law. *Id.* 3-4.

A magistrate judge’s non-dispositive pretrial order may be modified or set aside if it is “clearly erroneous or is contrary to law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). “[T]he magistrate’s factual determinations are reviewed for clear error, and the magistrate’s legal conclusions are reviewed to determine whether they are contrary to law.” *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, 268 F.R.D. 344, 348 (N.D. Cal. 2010). Having reviewed the briefing and underlying order, the Court finds no clear error and that Judge Cousins’s legal conclusion was not contrary to law. Judge Cousins did not find Quora’s showing adequate enough to grant the motion, and he applied the correct legal standard. Quora cannot come to this court for a do-over on the factual determination.

//

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 19, 2021



BETH LABSON FREEMAN
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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