

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

MARY PRASAD, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

No. 2:12-cv-00592 TLN JFM

vs.

COUNTY OF SUTTER, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

Plaintiff’s amended motion to compel production of documents was heard on June 12, 2013. Following the hearing, the court issued an order requiring defendants to submit “for in camera review those portions of the requested personnel files containing grievances against individual officers and Internal Affairs Reports, and any training attended by the officers” by June 28, 2013. ECF No. 91. Pursuant to the order, defendants have submitted the required documents.

The undersigned has reviewed the documents and considered defendants’ objections to production. Defendants object to producing Bates-stamped documents “Eaton 00058-00064,” on the grounds of third-party privacy and relevancy. As to the third-party privacy argument, the court finds that redaction of the documents with information unrelated to defendant Eaton will sufficiently address defendants’ objections. As to the relevance argument,

1 “[e]vidence is relevant if: (a) it has any tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it
2 would be without the evidence; and (b) the fact is of consequence in determining the action.”
3 Fed. R. Evid. 401. In the operative second amended complaint, plaintiffs allege that defendants
4 have been aware of, among other things, “widespread deficiencies in training. . . for the provision
5 of health care to inmates at Sutter County Jail.” ECF No. 50 at 3. The court finds that training
6 courses defendant Eaton attended are relevant to plaintiffs’ allegations.

7 Defendants also object to producing Bates-stamped document “Garbett 00021,”
8 on the grounds of privacy and relevancy. The court finds the issue of privacy is addressed by the
9 parties’ protective order. ECF No. 94. With regard to relevancy, plaintiffs allege that defendants
10 have been aware of deficiencies in staffing and have failed to provide appropriate staffing and
11 training at Sutter County Jail. See ECF No. 50 at 3, 33. The court finds the document is relevant
12 to these allegations.

13 Accordingly, the court ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

14 1. Within seven days of the date of this order, defendants shall produce the
15 following documents related to defendant Lester Eaton: Eaton 00058 (with lines 1-6 and 8-20 of
16 the attendance roster portion of the sheet redacted), Eaton 00059 (with lines 1-14 and 16-18 of
17 the attendance roster portion of the sheet redacted), Eaton 00060 (with lines 2-20 of the
18 attendance roster portion of the sheet redacted), Eaton 00061 (with lines 1-13 and 15-20 of the
19 attendance roster portion of the sheet redacted), Eaton 00062 (with lines 1-4 and 6-10 of the
20 attendance roster portion of the sheet redacted), Eaton 00063 (with lines 1 and 3-16 of the
21 attendance roster portion of the sheet redacted), and Eaton 00064 (with lines 1-15 and 17-20 of
22 the attendance roster portion of the sheet redacted).

23 2. Within seven days of the date of this order, defendants shall produce the
24 following document related to defendant Brent Garbett: Garbett 00021.

25 ////

26 ////

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

3. The court finds that the remaining documents submitted by defendants for in
camera review need not be produced.

Dated: July 2, 2013


CAROLYN K. DELANEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

pras0592.icr