

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

STORZ MANAGEMENT COMPANY, a
California Corporation, and STORZ
REALTY, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ANDREW CAREY, an individual, and
MARK WEINER, an individual,

Defendants.

No. 2:18-cv-0068 DAD DB

ORDER

This action came before the undersigned on March 17, 2023, for hearing of defendants' motion to quash. (ECF No. 116.) Attorneys Christopher Bakes and Bryan Sugar appeared via Zoom on behalf of the plaintiffs. Attorney Alex Kachmar appeared on behalf of the defendants.

At the hearing the undersigned expressed an intention to adopt plaintiffs' revision to defendants' alternative request for relief, specifically that the documents at issue be produced to defense counsel. Defense counsel would, thereafter, be allowed to review the responsive documents to make confidentiality designations pursuant to the stipulated protective order governing this action, and to redact for privacy or privilege, provided defendants produce a Rule 26 privilege log if applicable.


///

1 However, the undersigned expressed a concern that the subpoena, as currently phrased,
2 contained no temporal limitation with respect to the documents requested. In response, plaintiffs'
3 counsel offered to research the issue and propose a temporal limitation.

4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 5 1. Within fourteen days of the date of this order, plaintiffs' counsel shall determine an
6 appropriate proposed temporal limitation;
- 7 2. After plaintiffs' counsel has determined a proposed temporal limitation, the parties
8 shall meet and confer with fourteen days thereafter; and
- 9 3. Within seven days of the parties' meet and confer, the parties shall file a supplemental
10 Joint Statement not to exceed 6 pages.¹

11 Dated: March 23, 2023

12
13
14 
15 DEBORAH BARNES
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17 DLB:6
18 DB\orders\orders.civil\storz0068.oah.031723

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 ¹ The purpose of the supplemental Joint Statement is solely to address the temporal limitation of
28 the subpoenaed documents. The parties are not to rehash arguments already found in the Joint
Statement re Discovery Disagreement.