25

26

27

28

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 KARIN BJORK, No. 2:14-cv-1983-MCE-EFB 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. ORDER GRANTING IN PART THIRD PARTY MARSHALL'S REQUEST FOR 14 **EXTENSION OF TIME** COUNTY OF PLACER, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 This matter was before the court on July 20, 2016, for hearing on plaintiff's motions to 18 compel production of documents. After hearing, the court granted the motions for the reasons 19 stated on the record and directed counsel to confer and submit a proposed written order. In 20 granting the motions, the court weighed the relevance and need for the evidence against the 21 competing privacy interests raised by the defense. The court found the documents both relevant 22 and necessary to plaintiff's case. It further found that, in light of the existing protective order, on 23 balance the relevance and need for the documents outweighed the privacy interests raised by 24 defense counsel. Nonetheless, the court instructed counsel to include in the proposed written

The written order, filed on July 25, 2016 (ECF No. 60), allowed seven days (or until August 1) for third parties to object. No objections have been filed, but third party Megan Dean

order a process by which persons whose records would be produced could submit objections in

the event that they had interests not already addressed by defendants' opposition to the motion.

Marshall filed a motion for a thirty day extension of time (i.e., until August 30) to submit objections. ECF No. 61. That motion is granted, in part.

The Clerk is directed to forward a copy of this order and a copy of the protective order to Ms. Marshall by mail at the address listed in ECF No. 61. Defense counsel shall meet and confer with third party Marshall to advise her of the nature and contents of the documents to be released.

Ms. Marshall shall have until August 12, 2016, to submit her objections. The court notes that is does not need briefing that repeats or duplicates the briefs already filed by the parties herein. Ms. Marshall may, however, present information that focuses on her specific privacy concerns and address why the protective order entered would not sufficiently mitigate those concerns. The parties shall have until August 19, 2016 to respond.

DATED: August 2, 2016.

EDMUND F. BRENNAN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE