

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAURA NARANJO,
Plaintiff,
v.
WAL-MART STORES, INC.,
Defendant.

No. 2:15-cv-0882 KJM CKD


ORDER

Pending before the court is plaintiff's motion to compel further discovery responses. Because oral argument is not of material assistance, this matter is submitted on the briefs. E.D. Cal. L.R. 230(g). Upon review of the documents in support and opposition, and good cause appearing therefor, THE COURT ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:

1. The motion to compel (ECF No. 11) is granted in part and denied in part.
2. Within twenty-one days from the date of this order, defendant shall provide further responses, without objection, to interrogatories nos. 9-15, limited to stores located in Lodi, Stockton, Galt, Manteca, Elk Grove, Tracy, Antioch, Modesto, Livermore, Ceres, Sacramento, Pleasanton, Patterson, San Ramon, and Turlock.
3. Within twenty-one days from the date of this order, defendant shall provide, for inspection and copying, documents responsive to requests for production, nos. 11, 31 (limited to e-mail custodians Michelle Rau, Tim Jacobson, Christina Ramirez, Rickey Robertson and Joseph

1 Rubino), 32, 33, 34, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, and 46. Considering the proportionality of the document
2 requests to the needs of the case and the other factors set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
3 26(b)(1), the motion to compel document requests nos. 35-38, 43, 44, 47, 48, 50 and 51 is denied
4 without prejudice. Plaintiff may renew the motion to compel with respect to these document
5 requests upon a subsequent showing that factors not shown on the present motion or that changed
6 circumstances weigh in favor of plaintiff.

7 Dated: December 10, 2015

8 
9 _____
10 CAROLYN K. DELANEY
11 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

12 4 naranjo0882.mtc.subm
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28