

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. 5:25-cv-02814-KES

Date: December 19, 2025

Title: TIGRAN BEDROSIAN v. KRISTI NOEM, et al.

PRESENT:

THE HONORABLE KAREN E. SCOTT, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Jazmin Dorado
Courtroom Clerk

Not Present
Court Reporter

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR
PETITIONER:
None Present

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR
RESPONDENTS:
None Present

**PROCEEDINGS (IN CHAMBERS): Order GRANTING Petitioner’s Motion
for Discovery (Dkt. 17)**

On December 8, 2025, Petitioner moved for an order authorizing discovery in this habeas action. (Dkt. 17.) The motion includes 18 proposed requests for production (“RFPs”) (Dkt. 17-1) and asks to “reserve [his] right to serve” interrogatories (“rogs”) (Dkt. 17 at 13). On December 11, 2025, the Court held a telephonic status conference with the parties and ordered Respondents to file a response to the motion on or before December 16. (Dkt. 18.) Instead, on December 16, Respondents filed a “Notice of Conferring Between the Parties,” which states:

This court ordered a telephone conference [Dk. 12] that took place on December 11, 2025. At that time, Respondent[s] opposed Petitioner’s Motion for Discovery [Dkt. 17]. Since that time, the parties have met and conferred and are attempting to resolve the issues.

(Dkt. 21.) On December 16 and 17, the parties consented to the jurisdiction of the Magistrate Judge. (Dkt. 20, 23, 26.)

While the Court commends the parties for attempting to resolve their disputes informally, this is not a valid reason to ignore a Court-ordered deadline to respond to a motion, particularly since Respondents’ notice does not indicate that the parties have reached a resolution.

The Court finds that Petitioner’s motion demonstrates good cause to serve the RFPs on Respondents. See Bracy v. Gramley, 520 U.S. 899, 904 (1997) (“A habeas petitioner, unlike the

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 5:25-cv-02814-KES

Date: December 19, 2025

Page 2

usual civil litigant in federal court, is not entitled to discovery as a matter of ordinary course.”); Rule 6, Rules Governing §§ 2254 and 2255 Cases in the United States District Courts.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Petitioner’s motion (Dkt. 17) is **granted**.
2. The RFPs attached to the motion are hereby deemed served on Respondents as of the date of this Order. Respondents shall provide responsive documents or serve objections to the RFPs **within 30 days**, as provided in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34.
3. Petitioner may move to compel further responses to the RFPs if appropriate. The Court hereby authorizes the parties to bring any disputes about the RFPs to the Court using the telephonic informal discovery conference (“IDC”) procedure on the Court’s website. See Hon. Karen E. Scott, Judge’s Procedures ¶ 3, <https://apps.cacd.uscourts.gov/Jps/honorable-karen-e-scott>.
4. On or before **January 21, 2026**, the parties shall file a joint status report stating whether (a) Respondents have agreed to produce any of the documents sought by RFPs and, if so, the status of that production; (b) Respondents have objected to any of the RFPs; (c) Petitioner plans to serve rogs or seek any other discovery.

Initials of Deputy Clerk jd