

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DENNY R. BECKER, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., INC., et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:10-cv-2799 TLN KJN PS

ORDER

Plaintiff Denny Becker (“plaintiff”) and defendant Wells Fargo Bank (“defendant”) requested an informal discovery teleconference to allow the court to address the following matters: (1) defendant’s motion to quash plaintiff’s deposition subpoenas for Sharon Zuniga (“Zuniga”) and Joseph Ortega (“Ortega”); (2) plaintiff’s motion to compel discovery related to the identity of the Wells Fargo employee identified by the initials “LVZ” and request to take a deposition of the individual identified as LVZ; and (3) plaintiff’s motion to compel defendant to remove redactions from certain produced documents.¹

///
///

¹ (See ECF Nos. 163 at 4 (requiring the parties to request telephonic conferences before completing any further discovery filings); 164 at 3-4 (same).)

1 On February 14, 2014, the undersigned conducted the informal discovery teleconference.²
2 Plaintiff appeared telephonically on his own behalf. Attorney David Newman appeared
3 telephonically on defendant's behalf.

4 For the reasons discussed on the record during the teleconference, it is HEREBY
5 ORDERED THAT:

6 1. Plaintiff's motion to compel defendant to remove redactions from certain produced
7 documents is DENIED as untimely.

8 2. Plaintiff's motion to compel discovery related to the identity of the Wells Fargo
9 employee identified by the initials "LVZ" is DENIED as untimely.

10 3. Plaintiff's request to compel defendant to allow him to inspect ESI and loan files is
11 DENIED as both untimely and improperly noticed.

12 4. Defendant's motion to quash plaintiff's deposition subpoenas for Zuniga and Ortega is
13 GRANTED without prejudice to a renewed request by plaintiff to take depositions of either or
14 both individuals after plaintiff takes the deposition of defendant's person most knowledgeable
15 ("PMK") on February 21, 2014, provided that plaintiff makes a showing that defendant's PMK
16 was unable to testify as to certain information relevant to plaintiff's claims and that it will be
17 necessary for plaintiff to conduct a deposition of either or both individuals in order to obtain that
18 information. This grant of defendant's motion is also without prejudice to any future requests by
19 plaintiff to take depositions of other individuals provided that plaintiff can make the same above
20 showing with respect to those individuals.

21 5. Plaintiff's request to conduct a deposition of the person identified by the initials "LVZ"
22 is DENIED without prejudice to a renewed request by plaintiff to take that individual's deposition
23 upon a showing that defendant's PMK was unable to testify as to certain information relevant to
24 plaintiff's claims and that it will be necessary for plaintiff to conduct a deposition of that
25 individual in order to obtain that information.

26 ///

27 _____
28 ² This action proceeds before this court pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rule
302(c)(21) and 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

