26

1 2 3 4 5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 7 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DIANE ADOMA, et al., 8 9 Plaintiffs, No. CIV S-10-0059 LKK GGH 10 VS. 11 THE UNIVERSITY OF PHOENIX, INC. et al., 12 Defendants. **ORDER** 13 14 Presently before the court are two amended motions to compel discovery filed by 15 plaintiffs on August 26, 2010 (Docket #s 76 and 77.) The parties filed joint statements on 16 September 13, 2010, and appeared telephonically for hearing on September 16, 2010. Megan 17 Ross Hutchins appeared for plaintiffs. Jason Mills represented defendants. Having reviewed the 18 stipulations and heard oral argument, the court now issues the following summary order. 19 For the reasons stated at hearing, IT IS ORDERED that: 20 1. Plaintiffs' motion to compel production of documents, set one, filed August 4, 21 2010, as amended on September 13, 2010, (dkt. #s 65, 88), is granted in part. Within twenty-22 eight (28) days of this order, defendants shall produce discovery requests and responses as 23 limited to interrogatories and requests for admission only, in the following cases: Sabol v. 24 Apollo Group, No. 2:09CV03439-JCJ, Davis v. University of Phoenix, No. 8.09CV2971-25 <sup>1</sup> If the district court or the Ninth Circuit issues a stay of this action, discovery activities

would cease immediately, but not until such an order has issued.

T26AEP, Juric v. University of Phoenix, No. 09CV3214-OWD-JWJx, and Tratichita v. Apollo Group, Inc., No. 1:09CV4873. Plaintiffs shall share the costs of this production with defendants insofar as hard copy costs are involved. 2. Plaintiffs' motion to compel production of documents, set two, filed August 11, 2010, as amended on September 13, 2010, (dkt. #s 68, 89), is denied without prejudice to its renewal for good cause shown after plaintiffs have taken a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition. DATED: September 21, 2010 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE GGH:076/Adoma0059.dsy2.wpd