

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

NEWARK GROUP, INC.,

Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-08-2623 GEB DAD

v.

DOPACO INC.,

Defendant.

ORDER

_____/

This case came before the court on September 11, 2009, for hearing on defendant’s motion to compel further responses to interrogatories and requests for production (Doc. No. 14). Michael P. Pulliam, Esq. appeared for defendant and moving party Dopaco Inc. Marc W. Poe, Esq. appeared for plaintiff Newark Group, Inc.


For the reasons stated in open court, defendant’s motion to compel further responses to interrogatories and requests for production was granted in part. Plaintiff will be required to supplement their written responses to describe what has been produced in response to each request and, with respect to the request for production, to describe the search that has been conducted with respect to the items produced. Those revised responses shall be provided to

/////
/////

1 defense counsel within ten days of the date of this order.¹ In all other respects the motion to
2 compel was denied. See In re Grand Jury Subpoena, 357 F.3d 900, 907-10 (9th Cir. 2004)
3 (documents prepared by an investigator who also acted as an environmental consultant with
4 respect to pollution site found to be entitled to work product protection).

5 IT IS ORDERED.

6 DATED: September 14, 2009.

7
8 
9 _____
10 DALE A. DROZD
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12 Ddad1/orders.civil/newark2623.oah.091109

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25 _____
26 ¹ In this regard, the court noted at the hearing that plaintiff's counsel had essentially provided these descriptions in the joint stipulation with respect to the discovery dispute but had not done so in the formal responses to defendant's discovery requests.