

1 John D. O'Connor (SBN 54238)  
[john@joclaw.com](mailto:john@joclaw.com)  
2 Jeffrey D. Kirk (SBN 113163)  
[jeff@joclaw.com](mailto:jeff@joclaw.com)  
3 Jessica Shafer (SBN 297856)  
[jessica@joclaw.com](mailto:jessica@joclaw.com)  
4 O'CONNOR AND ASSOCIATES  
201 Mission Street, Suite 710  
5 San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: (415) 693-9960  
6 Facsimile: (415) 692-6537

7 Attorney for Defendants  
RONALD D. MOORE, TANYA E. MOORE,  
8 KENNETH RANDOLPH MOORE, MAREJKA SACKS,  
ELMER LEROY FALK, ZACHARY M. BEST,  
9 MOORE LAW FIRM, a California Professional  
Corporation, MISSION LAW FIRM, a California  
10 Professional Corporation, GEOSHUA LEVINSON,  
RICK D. MOORE, WEST COAST CASP  
11 AND ADA SERVICES, a California Corporation,  
RONNY LORETO  
12

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
14 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
15 **FRESNO DIVISION**

16 FATEMEH SANIEFAR,  
17  
18 Plaintiff(s),

19 vs.

20 RONALD D. MOORE, TANYA E.  
MOORE, KENNETH RANDOLPH  
21 MOORE, MAREJKA SACKS, ELMER  
LEROY FALK, ZACHARY M. BEST,  
22 MOORE LAW FIRM, a California  
Professional Corporation, MISSION LAW  
23 FIRM, a California Professional  
Corporation, GEOSHUA LEVINSON,  
24 RICK D. MOORE, WEST COAST CASP  
AND ADA SERVICES, a California  
25 Corporation, RONNY LORETO,  
26 Defendant(s).

Case No. 1:17-cv-00823-LJO-BAM

**ORDER APPROVING  
STIPULATION TO RESOLVE  
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE  
ORDER [Dckt 77]**

---

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

Plaintiff, Defendants, and third-party ADA Inspector LLC have entered into a stipulation to resolve the Motion for Protective Order (Dckt. No. 77) regarding the subpoena issued by Plaintiff to ADA Inspector LLC.

The Court having reviewed the stipulation, and for good cause appearing therein now rules as follows:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the stipulation to resolve the Motion for Protective Order be and is hereby APPROVED (Dckt. No. 85).

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Court will retain jurisdiction to decide any disputes arising under the stipulation to resolve Motion for Protective Order, including any remedies provided by Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 11, 16, 26 and 37.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 3, 2018

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE