

1 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
 ERIC W. SITARCHUK, Admitted *pro hac vice*
 2 eric.sitarchuk@morganlewis.com
 KELLY A. MOORE, Admitted *pro hac vice*
 3 kelly.moore@morganlewis.com
 BENJAMIN P. SMITH, Bar No. 197551
 4 benjamin.smith@morganlewis.com
 KEVIN M. PAPAY, Bar No. 274161
 5 kevin.papay@morganlewis.com
 One Market, Spear Street Tower
 6 San Francisco, CA 94105-1596
 Tel: +1.415.442.1000
 7 Fax: +1.415.442.1001

8 Attorneys for Defendant
 RITE AID CORPORATION
 9

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 11 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 12

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and the
 STATES OF CALIFORNIA, et al., *ex rel.*
 14 LOYD F. SCHMUCKLEY, JR.,

15 Plaintiffs,

16 vs.

17 RITE AID CORPORATION,

18 Defendant.

19 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, *ex rel.* LOYD
 20 F. SCHMUCKLEY, JR.,

21 Plaintiffs,

22 vs.

23 RITE AID CORPORATION,

24 Defendant.
 25
 26
 27
 28

Case No. 2:12-cv-01699-KJM-EFB

**JOINT MOTION TO AMEND
 DEADLINES RE: RITE AID
 CORPORATION'S PRODUCTION OF
 DOCUMENTS RESPONSIVE TO
 CALIFORNIA RPD NOS. 69, 72, 75, 84, 88,
 AND 121-123**

[ECF NO. 365]

1 Plaintiff-Intervenor State of California (“California”) and Defendant Rite Aid Corporation
2 (“Rite Aid”) jointly move for an order amending the deadline for Rite Aid to comply with the part
3 of the Court’s October 16, 2020 order (ECF No. 365) requiring Rite Aid to produce all documents
4 responsive to California’s Request for Production (“RPD”) Nos. 69, 72, 75, 84, 88, and 121-123
5 by November 16, 2020. The parties request that the foregoing deadline be extended by three
6 weeks, to December 7, 2020.

7 This joint motion is made on the grounds that unanticipated events at Rite Aid’s corporate
8 headquarters have significantly delayed the search, collection, and review of documents
9 maintained at Rite Aid’s corporate headquarters that are potentially responsive to the above
10 requests. On October 22, 2020, Rite Aid’s corporate headquarters office unexpectedly lost
11 power. To date, power at Rite Aid’s corporate headquarters still has not been restored. Efforts to
12 restore power are ongoing, but are expected to last approximately a week. Rite Aid did not
13 anticipate this lengthy power outage when the parties discussed with the Court at the October 14,
14 2020 hearing how much time Rite Aid anticipated it would need to complete its production of
15 documents responsive to RPD Nos. 69, 72, 75, 84, 88, and 121-123.

16 Therefore, Rite Aid moves to amend the court order, ECF No. 365, as follows:

Event	Original Deadline	Amended Deadline
Rite Aid shall produce all documents responsive to California RPD Nos. 69, 72, 75, 84, 88, and 121-123, subject to California’s qualification that RPD Nos. 69, 72, 75, 84 seek only documents that “actually discuss, reflect, or documents” delegations or authorizations.	November 16, 2020	December 7, 2020

23 Relying, in good faith, on Rite Aid’s representations, California joins the motion.

24 //
25 //
26 //
27 //
28 //

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

Dated: November 9, 2020

Respectfully Submitted,

XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General of the State of California

/s/ Emmanuel R. Salazar (as authorized on 11/9/20)

Emmanuel R. Salazar
Deputy Attorney General
2329 Gateway Oaks Drive, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95833-4252
Tel: (916) 621-1835; Fax: (916) 621-1835
Email: Emmanuel.Salazar@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff-Intervenor
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Dated: November 9, 2020

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

/s/ Kevin M. Papay

Kevin M. Papay
Attorneys for Defendant
RITE AID CORPORATION

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

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Upon consideration of Plaintiff-Intervenor State of California (“California”) and Defendant Rite Aid Corporation’s (“Rite Aid”) Joint Motion To Amend Deadlines Re: Rite Aid Production of Documents Responsive to California’s RPD Nos. 69, 72, 75, 84, 88, and 121-123, and finding good cause, IT IS ORDERED that ECF No. 365 is amended as follows:

Event	Original Deadline	Revised Deadline
Rite Aid shall produce all documents responsive to California RPD Nos. 69, 72, 75, 84, 88, and 121-123, subject to California’s qualification that RPD Nos. 69, 72, 75, 84 seek only documents that “actually discuss, reflect, or documents” delegations or authorizations.	November 16, 2020	December 7, 2020

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 13, 2020

EDMUND F. BRENNAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE