

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**

TATYANA HARGROVE,  
  
                    Plaintiff,  
  
                    v.  
  
CITY OF BAKERSFIELD, et al.,  
  
                    Defendants.

Case No.: 1:17-cv-01743- JLT  
  
AMENDED ORDER AFTER IN CAMERA  
REVIEW OF RECORDS OF VISTA WEST HIGH  
SCHOOL

At the informal conference re: discovery dispute (Doc. 23), the parties agreed the Court would conduct an in camera review of educational and employment records of the plaintiff. The Court has received and reviewed the records from Vista West High School<sup>1</sup>, which included records from Stockdale High School, and Tevis Junior High School. Of these records, the Court finds very few are discoverable because they contain no information which may bear on the issues in this case or because discovery of these records is not proportional to the needs of the case (Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(b)(1)). As to the records to be disclosed, the Court makes no comment as to their admissibility. Thus, the Court

**ORDERS:**

1. A portion of the document entitled “Vista West High School Student Discipline Profile”

---

<sup>1</sup> In its original order, the Court mistakenly indicated that the records were provided by the Kern High School District. Since the Court issued the order, it received a “Certificate of no records,” from the Kern High School District and has confirmed that the records discussed here, were produced by the custodian of record from Vista West High School.

1 SHALL be disclosed. This document is numbered “1 of 13” through “13 of 13.” Of these, only pages  
2 “1 of 13” through “9 of 13” SHALL be disclosed to the defendants;

3 2. The document entitled “Stockdale High School Refrain From Verbal Contact . . .” dated  
4 “2/21/13” related to “Incident # 36501” SHALL be disclosed to the defendants;

5 3. The eight documents entitled “Tevis Junior High School Disciplinary Action Form”  
6 with incident dates listed as “09/22/2011,” “11/16/2011,” “02/08/2012,” “09/12/2011,” “06/02/2011,”  
7 “05/12/2011,” “03/29/2011,” and “01/18/2011” SHALL be disclosed to the defendants;

8 4. These documents remain due to be produced five court days from the date of the original  
9 order.

10  
11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 Dated: November 2, 2018

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE