

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BOBBY DARRELL JOHNSON, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
v.  
SHASTA COUNTY, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-1338-KJM-EFB

## ORDER

SHASTA COUNTY, et al.,  
Defendants

On June 17, 2015, this case was before the court for hearing on plaintiffs' motions to compel non-party Mary Todd's compliance with a subpoena duces tecum (ECF No. 35) and to compel defendants Sutter County, Matthew Maples, James Casner, and Michael T. Gwinnup ("Sutter defendants") to produce documents (ECF No. 37). Attorney Kennedy Helm appeared on behalf of plaintiffs. Attorney John Whitefleet appeared on behalf of the Sutter defendants. Attorney Cameron Cobden appeared on behalf of non-party Mary Todd.

For the reasons stated on the record, the court reserves ruling on motion to compel compliance with a subpoena duces tecum (ECF No. 35) until after the parties have attempted to resolve the dispute before the California Superior Court. Plaintiffs' motion to compel documents is granted as to Requests for Production Numbers 1(a)-(p), 2, 3, 4(a)-(b), 5-17,<sup>1</sup> 21-26. The Sutter

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs' Request for Production of Documents Number 15 seeks "Any and all DOCUMENTS obtained from *any other source* (i.e., not generated by Defendants), including any

1 defendants shall produce documents responsive to these requests within 14 days of the date of this  
2 order. When producing the responsive documents, the Sutter defendants shall identify the  
3 specific request(s) to which each document pertains. To the extent defendants contend that there  
4 are no responsive documents for a particular request, defendants shall provide a verification  
5 detailing the search that was conducted, signed by an individual with personal knowledge, and  
6 certifying that no responsive documents were found. The motion is denied in all other respects.

7 So Ordered.

8 DATED: July 2, 2015.

  
9 EDMUND F. BRENNAN  
10 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

---

26 other law enforcement agency, regarding the INCIDENT or PLAINTIFFS. ECF No. 39 at 37  
27 (emphasis added). As explained at the hearing, the request for documents from “any other  
28 source” is overly broad. Therefore, in response to this request the Sutter Defendants need only  
produce documents from the California Highway Patrol, Shasta County Sheriff’s Office, Sutter  
County District Attorney’s Office, and Shasta County District Attorney’s Office.