1				
2				
3	NOT FOR CITATION			
4				
5				
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
8			EUREKA DIVISION	
9	EUREKA DIVISION			
10				
11	DERRICK CLARK, et al.,			No. CV 96-1486 CRB/NJV
12	Plaintiffs,			ORDER COMPELLING PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS AND ADDRESSING
13	V. ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY ISSUES			
14	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,			
15	//			
16				
17	This matter is before the court on Plaintiffs' request to compel the production of various			
18	documents related to the deposition of the State of California's rebuttal expert, Dr. Scaramozzino.			
19	The Court, having considered the parties' written submissions and the argument of counsel presented			
20	at the April 6, 2010 telephonic hearing, hereby orders as follows:			
21	1.	•		il 13, 2010, counsel for the State shall:
22		a.		ramozzino has produced all drafts of his expert report
23			that are in his posses	
24		b.	-	ramozzino contact the parties to whom he circulated the
25			•	to his March 7, 2010 email to counsel for the State to
26			-	any of those parties have preserved a copy of that
27			missing draft report;	
28		c.	Confirm that counsel	for the State is not in possession of the missing draft
			report attached to Dr	. Scaramozzino's March 7, 2010; and

Inquire with the information technology professionals that serve the Attorney
General's office as to whether there exists any back up, archived or other such
copy of Dr. Scaramozzino's March 7. 2010 email with the missing draft report
attached.

2. Should any of these efforts result in the discovery of the missing draft report, or any other draft reports not previously produced to Plaintiffs, the State shall immediately produce the same to counsel for Plaintiffs. In the event that the missing draft report cannot be located through the efforts detailed herein, Plaintiffs may move the Court for an appropriate remedy.

3. Based upon the Court's in camera inspection of the remaining two documents in dispute (i.e., "Summary of Clark Deposition" and "Clark v. California - DDP information"), as well as the Court's review of Dr. Scaramozzino's expert report and the explanation of defense counsel as to why those two documents were attached to Dr. Scaramozzino's March 25, 2010 email, the Court finds that those two documents "could reasonably be viewed as germane to the subject matter on which the expert has offered an opinion" and are therefore discoverable Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(2)(B). See Securities and Exchange Commission v. Reyes, 2007 WL 963422, \*2 n. 2 (N.D.Cal. March 30, 2007); South Yuba River Citizens League v. National Marine Fisheries Service, 257 F.R.D. 607, 610-15 (E.D.Cal. May 6, 2009). Counsel for the State shall produce copies of the "Summary of Clark Deposition" and the "Clark v. California - DDP information" documents to counsel for Plaintiffs by close of business on April 6, 2010.

3. The April 7, 2010 deposition of Dr. Scaramozzino shall re-scheduled for a time and place that is mutually convenient for the parties and the witness and shall be completed no later April 23, 2010.

4. No later than close of business on April 9, 2010, the parties shall submit a joint proposed protective order regarding the redacted declarations addressed at the March 26, 2010 discovery hearing. Within one business day of entry of the protective order

**United States District Court** For the Northern District of California

by the Court, Plaintiffs shall produce to the State unredacted copies of the declarations at issue. 5. Inmate Daniel Mendez shall either be produced for deposition or withdrawn from Plaintiffs' witness list by close of business on April 15, 2010. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: April 6, 2010 NANDOR J. VADAS United States Magistrate Judge