

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LEON JEROME MARTIN,
Plaintiff,
v.
CITY OF VALLEJO, et al.,
Defendants

No. 2:14-cv-0554 DAD PS

ORDER

This matter came before the court on December 10, 2014, for the hearing of plaintiff's October 16, 2014, motion to compel (Dkt. No. 27) and plaintiff's motion regarding the terms of a protective order. (Dkt. No. 26.) Assistant City Attorney Kelly Trujillo appeared on behalf of the defendants and plaintiff Leon Martin appeared on his own behalf.

Upon consideration of the arguments on file and at the hearing, and for the reasons set forth on the record at the hearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's motion to compel (Dkt. No. 27) and motion regarding the terms of a protective order (Dkt. No. 26) are granted;

|||||

11111

1111


11111

1 2. Within 30 days, defendants shall produce to plaintiff responsive documents for the
2 prior ten years or submit some, or all, of those documents to the court for in camera review¹ if
3 necessary²;

4 3. Defendants shall also file a proposed stipulated protective order and serve a
5 copy of that proposed stipulated protective order on plaintiff; and

6 4. Plaintiff shall file objections to the proposed stipulated protective order, if any,
7 within fourteen days of the date plaintiff is served with a copy of the proposed stipulated
8 protective order.

9 Dated: December 10, 2014

10 
11

12 DALE A. DROZD
13 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

14 DAD:6
15 Ddad1\orders.consent\martin0554.oah.121014.docx

24

25 ¹ Defendants are cautioned that documents should be submitted for the court's in camera review
26 only if truly necessary and that defendant's submission should not be voluminous. If defendants'
27 submission does not comply with these principles the court will reconsider the order allowing
28 defendants to submit documents for in camera review prior to production.

2 ² In the event that defendants move for reconsideration of this order, this order shall be stayed
2 pending the court's ruling on defendants' motion for reconsideration.