

1 JAMES R. KIRBY II [SBN: 88911]
 2 **NAGELEY, KIRBY & WINBERRY, LLP**
 3 8801 Folsom Boulevard, Suite 172
 4 Sacramento, CA 95926
 5 Telephone No: (916) 386-8282
 6 Facsimile No: (916) 386-8952

7
 8 Attorneys for Plaintiff DOROTHY RODDEN JACKSON

9
 10 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

11 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12 DOROTHY RODDEN JACKSON,

Case No.: 2:16-cv-00891-TLN-KJN

13 Plaintiff,

**STIPULATION AND ORDER RE
 MOTIONS TO COMPEL FURTHER
 RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S REQUESTS
 FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS
 (SETS ONE AND TWO)**

14 vs.

15 RICHARD CALONE; CALONE & HARREL
 16 LAW GROUP, LLP; CALONE & BEATTIE,
 17 LLP; CALONE LAW GROUP, LLP,

DATE: APRIL 27, 2017

TIME: 10:00

DEPT: 25

TRIAL DATE: NONE SET

18 Defendant.

19 The parties stipulate the Court may drop the pending hearings on Plaintiff's motions to
 20 compel further responses to Requests for Production of Documents (Sets One and Two) [ECF
 21 Nos. 81 & 82], and issue the following order:

22 1. Defendants shall serve amended responses to Plaintiff's Requests for Production of
 23 Documents (Sets One and Two) as follows:

24 (A) Requests Nos. 1-3, 10, 18-35, 37-41, & 43 (Set One) & 44-71 (Set Two):

25 The amended response shall identify each request. Defendants shall produce responsive
 26 documents, identified and correlated to each respective request by Bates number. If Defendants
 27 have already produced responsive documents, they need not be produced again. For documents
 28 previously produced, Defendants need only identify the request and correlate previously-produced
 responsive documents to that request by Bates number.

1 If documents responsive to an individual request do not exist, Defendants shall state for
2 each request that responsive documents either (a) never existed, (b) once existed and were lost or
3 destroyed (with an explanation of the circumstances) or (c) are believed to currently exist but
4 cannot be located with a description of the efforts made to locate them.

5 (B) Requests Nos. 4-9 (Set One):

6 The parties agree Plaintiff's present inability to access metadata on electronic files
7 Defendants have produced appears to be a technical problem rather than a refusal or failure to
8 produce on Defendants' part. The parties agree to work together in good faith to transfer to
9 Plaintiff the responsive requested files in native format with metadata intact in an accessible form.
10 This agreement is without prejudice to the right of either party to seek relief from the Court should
11 their efforts prove unavailing.

12 (C) Requests Nos. 11 & 17 (Set One):

13 If Defendants have responsive documents but contend they are privileged, they shall
14 provide Plaintiff with a privilege log within the time limit provided in Paragraph 2. Otherwise,
15 Defendants shall respond as provided in Paragraph 1(A).

16 2. Defendants shall serve their responses to Sets One and Two and produce responsive
17 documents within thirty days of the date of this order.

18 3. This order resolves the motions filed at ECF Nos. 81 and 82.

19 SO STIPULATED:

20 Dated: April 20, 2017


/s/ Theresa M. LaVoie
Theresa M. LaVoie
Counsel for Defendants

21
22
23 Dated: April 20, 2017

/s/ James R. Kirby II
James R. Kirby II
Counsel for Plaintiff

24
25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 Dated: April 21, 2017

27
28 
KENDALL J. NEWMAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE