

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

ARC OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
TOBY DOUGLAS, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:11-cv-2545 MCE CKD

ORDER

Plaintiffs’ motion to compel and defendants’ motion to compel came on regularly for hearing on June 18, 2014. Chad Carlock appeared for plaintiffs. Grant Lien appeared for defendants. Upon review of the documents in support and opposition, upon hearing the arguments of counsel, and good cause appearing therefor, THE COURT FINDS AND ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

1. For the reasons stated on the record at the hearing, plaintiff’s motion to compel (ECF No. 136) is denied. The denial is without prejudice to renewal of the motion if the Medicaid claim is reinstated and plaintiffs are granted permission to exceed the presumptive limit on the number of interrogatories.

2. Defendants’ motion to compel (ECF No. 134) is granted in part. Within twenty-eight days, plaintiffs shall provide further responses to the interrogatories as follows:

////

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

No. 7--current lists of consumer members, to the extent maintained by the plaintiff associations and their respective subchapters. Plaintiffs shall also provide UCI numbers for the identified members, to the extent these numbers are maintained by the individual subchapters of the plaintiff associations;

No. 10--lists of provider members from 2008 to the present, to the extent known by the plaintiff associations and their respective subchapters;

No. 18--lists of provider members from 2008 to the present which have ceased operations and the reasons therefor, to the extent known by the plaintiff associations and their respective subchapters.

The motion to compel further responses to interrogatories nos. 1, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 20 is denied.

3. The parties represented that they are in good faith working on a stipulated protective order. Pending the filing and approval of such a stipulated order, all discovery produced pursuant to the instant order on the motions to compel shall be subject to a protective order that it shall be used solely for purposes of this litigation and that confidential information of members of the plaintiff associations shall not be made a part of the public record.

4. The court finds an award of expenses is not warranted.

Dated: June 19, 2014

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CAROLYN K. DELANEY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

4 arccal.oah