

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAHINAH IBRAHIM,  
Plaintiff,

No. C 06-00545 WHA

v.

**ORDER RE DEPOSITIONS**

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND  
SECURITY, et al.,  
Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /


The parties dispute the interpretation of an April 19 order regarding depositions (Dkt. No. 461). To reiterate, the Court is of the view that depositions will be of extremely limited value in this action. Nonetheless, the order granted plaintiff leave to take total of three depositions between the date of the order and the July 31 discovery cutoff. For any remaining depositions within this limit, plaintiff may notice either 30(b)(6) or fact witness depositions as plaintiff sees fit. Any 30(b)(6) depositions must comply with ¶ 24 of the supplemental order (Dkt. No. 3). Regardless of the type, counsel are admonished to avoid privileged and classified material. No additional 30(b)(6) or fact witness depositions will be allowed absent prior Court approval.

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

For the avoidance of doubt, plaintiff's own deposition and depositions of experts do not count toward this three-deposition limit.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: June 4, 2013.



---

WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE