1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	DANNY BROWN,	) Case No.: 1:14-cv-01812 JLT	
12	Plaintiff,	<ul> <li>ORDER AFTER IN CAMERA REVIEW OF</li> <li>RECORDS PRODUCED BY THE CITY OF</li> </ul>	
13	V.	) WASCO	
14	AUBREY WIMBERLY,	)	
15	Defendants.	) )	
16			
17	On August 8, 2016, the Court conducted an informal conference related a discovery dispute.		
18	(Doc. 43) At the conference, counsel agreed that the records would be produced from the CA State		
19	Personnel Board, related to Mr. Brown's employment with the CDCR, and records produced by the		
20	City of Wasco to the Court to conduct an in camera review.		
21	The Court has now conducted the review of the records from the City of Wasco. The Court		
22	finds that there is nothing in the record that bears on Mr. Brown's claim for emotional distress		
23	damages. There is no evidence the employment ended due to any fault of either party and no evidence		
24	of claims similar to those made in this case. In addition, the Court finds that there is nothing in the		
25	record that could lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Therefore, the Court <b>ORDERS</b> :		
26	1. The documents produced by the City of Wasco need not be produced to the defendants		
27	and the subpoena duces tecum is <b>QUASHED</b> .		
28			
		1	

1	2. <b>No later than September 23, 2016</b> , plaintiff's counsel <b>SHALL</b> retrieve from the Clerk		
2	of the Court at the United States Courthouse, located at 510 19 <sup>th</sup> Street, Bakersfield, CA, the copy of		
3	the records produced by the City of Wasco.		
4			
5	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
6	Dated:	/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston	
7		JNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		2	