

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 December 17, 2010, for hearing on plaintiffs’ motion to compel further responses to their Request for Production of Documents, Set 7, Nos. 68, 70, 71, 73, 79, and 80, and request for sanctions, as well as defendant’s motion for protective order regarding the requests at issue. Attorneys Larry Lockshin and Jennifer Marsh appeared for plaintiffs. Attorneys Stephanie L. Quinn and Naisha Covarrubias appeared for defendant Union Pacific Railroad Company.

The parties’ Joint Discovery Stipulation (Doc. No. 138) was considered, along with the parties’ arguments at the hearing.

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

1. Plaintiffs’ motion to compel further responses to their Request for Production of Documents, Set 7 (Doc. No. 116) is granted in part and denied in part. The motion is granted

1 as to Request Nos. 70, 73, 79, and 80, except that these requests are limited to documents for
2 calendar years 2008 and 2009. Plaintiffs' motion is denied as to Request Nos. 68 and 71 and as
3 to the request for sanctions.

4 2. All documents produced pursuant to this order shall be served on plaintiffs'
5 counsel so that they are received on or before January 7, 2011.

6 3. Defendants' motion for protective order (Doc. No. 113) is granted, and all
7 documents produced pursuant to this order are subject to the stipulated protective order filed
8 December 8, 2010 (Doc. No. 135).

9 DATED: December 17, 2010.

10
11 
12 _____
13 DALE A. DROZD
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

13 DAD:kw
14 Ddad1\orders.civil\gilmore2180.oah.121710