

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT MITCHELL, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

No. 2:08-cv-1196 JAM EFB P

vs.

T. FELKER, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____/

On October 24, 2012, the court heard defendants’ motion for a protective order and plaintiffs’ motion to compel. Dckt. Nos. 125, 127. Attorneys Christopher Becker and Erin Sullivan appeared at the hearing on behalf of defendants; attorneys Manu Pradhan and Rebekah Evenson appeared on behalf of plaintiffs. As stated on the record and for the reasons stated on the record, both requests were granted in part, as follows:

1. Defendants shall respond to plaintiffs’ requests for production of documents by producing all readily available documents now, and the remainder on a rolling basis, in accordance with the schedule proposed by defendants in the parties’ joint statement. *See* Dckt. No. 132 at 13-14.

2. The parties shall meet and confer to define the scope of electronic discovery, with their respective information technology specialists, by close of business on October 31, 2012.

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

3. Defendant Cate's objections to plaintiffs' interrogatories are overruled. Defendant Cate shall substantively respond to interrogatories 1-11 by October 30, 2012. Defendant Cate shall substantively respond to interrogatories 12-17 by November 6, 2012.

4. The Clerk of the Court shall terminate docket entries 125 and 127.

So Ordered.

DATED: October 25, 2012.


EDMUND F. BRENNAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE