

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
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JAN RICHMOND,) Case No.: 1:14-cv-00184 JLT
)
Plaintiff,) ORDER AFTER IN CAMERA REVIEW
)
v.)
)
MISSION BANK,)
)
Defendants.)
)

On February 19, 2015, the Court held an informal telephone conference regarding a discovery dispute between the parties. At the conference, Defendant agreed to amend its response to requests 18 and 20¹ of the request for production to indicate that it had located no document responsive to the requests.

As to requests 21, 22, 23 and 24, Defendant agreed to produce the documents for an in camera review. On March 2, 2015, the Court conducted the review. Along with the documents for review, Defendants provided a statement related to the impact an applicant’s credit history has on hiring decisions. In the statement, Defendant reported that after searching, it had no documents responsive to requests 23 and 24. Thus, Defendant SHALL provide an amended response to requests 23 and 24.

In the summary, Defendant agreed also to produce redacted copies of the documents related to

¹ The Court’s last order erroneously indicated Defendant would amend as to “18 and 21.” (Doc. 34 at 1)

1 request 21. In particular, Defendant indicated it would produce the application and resume related to
2 this applicant but would redact all personal identifiers, including the applicant's *personal*² contact
3 information, driver's license number, social security number and salary details. Thus, Defendant
4 SHALL provide an amended response to request 21 along with copies of these documents.

5 At this time, the Court is not inclined to release any further documents reviewed but authorizes
6 Plaintiff to file a motion to compel, compliant with Local Rule 251(c), if she chooses.³ In any event,
7 the Court **ORDERS**:

8 1. No later than **March 9, 2015**, Defendant **SHALL** provide an amended response to
9 requests 21, 23 and 24. At the same time, Defendant SHALL provide its privilege log if it has not
10 already done so;

11 2. Plaintiff is authorized to file a motion to compel as to request 21 (to the extent the
12 documents produced do not satisfy Plaintiff) and as to request 22.

13
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: March 2, 2015

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 ² Contact information for the applicant at Defendant's place of business is not "personal" and should not be redacted.

28 ³ However, the Court encourages the parties to consider a compromise. For example, the parties may agree that if the nature of the credit issue, e.g., medical bills, mortgage, etc., was divulged along with providing any documents related to the analysis done by Defendant in evaluating the applicant's employment, that this may be sufficient.