

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

JEREMY GILMORE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

No. CIV S-09-02180 JAM DAD

v.

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD
COMPANY, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /
This case came before the court on November 19, 2010, for hearing on plaintiffs’ motion to compel further responses to Requests for Production of Documents, Sets 3 and 4, and request for sanctions (Doc. No. 75) and plaintiff Dana Gilmore’s motion to compel further responses to Request for Admissions and corresponding Interrogatories, and request for sanctions (Doc. No. 77). Larry Lockshin, Esq. appeared for plaintiffs. Naisha Covarrubias, Esq. appeared for defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company.

The parties’ Joint Discovery Stipulations were considered, along with their arguments at the hearing.

For the reasons set forth in great detail on the record, IT IS ORDERED that:

- 1. Plaintiffs’ motion to compel further responses to their Requests for Production of Documents, Sets 3 and 4 (Doc. No. 75) is granted as those requests were limited on the record

1 in open court; defendant's further responses (including any response stating that the requested
2 documents have previously been produced pursuant to other requests) shall be served within 21
3 days after the date on which this order is filed;

4 2. Plaintiff Dana Gilmore's motion to compel further responses to her Request
5 for Admissions and corresponding Interrogatories (Doc. No. 77) is denied without prejudice; and

6 3. The requests for sanctions included in both motions (Doc. Nos. 75 and 77) are
7 denied.

8 DATED: November 22, 2010.

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

12 DAD:kw
13 Ddad1\orders.civil\gilmore2180.oah.111910
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26