

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHARLIE EAP,)
)
Plaintiff(s),)
)
v.)
)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et)
al.,)
)
Defendant(s).)

No. C07-2301 SI (BZ)

SUSAN WYCKOFF,)
)
Plaintiff(s),)
)
v.)
)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et)
al.,)
)
Defendant(s).)

No. C07-3600 SI (BZ)

SEVENTH DISCOVERY ORDER

Before the Court is a letter from plaintiff Wyckoff dated November 20, 2008 (Doc. 108) which I have deemed to be a motion for a protective order delaying one or more depositions scheduled to begin Monday, November 24, 2008. Also before the court is a letter from the government dated November 20, 2008 (Doc. 111) which I have deemed an opposition to the motion for

1 protective order. Following a telephone conference to resolve
2 the dispute, held on November 21, 2008 at 3:00 p.m., at which
3 the parties were represented by counsel, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED**
4 that the motion is **DENIED** for the following reasons:

5 1. Plaintiff's principal complaint is that she received
6 certain documents relevant to those depositions on October 31,
7 2008 which should have been produced earlier. Plaintiff has
8 not shown good cause for delaying her filing of the motion for
9 protective order until the Thursday before the depositions
10 were to have taken place.

11 2. Nor has plaintiff satisfactorily explained why she
12 agreed to the deposition schedule on November 12, 2008 knowing
13 that she would be examining witnesses about documents she had
14 received on October 31, 2008.

15 3. Plaintiff has not established that any prejudice will
16 result from the taking of the scheduled depositions that
17 cannot be cured by a subsequent order of the court.

18 4. It has been very difficult to get the parties to
19 agree on the current deposition schedule. There is no good
20 reason why the schedule should not go forward as agreed.

21 Dated: November 24, 2008

22 
23 Bernard Zimmerman
24 United States Magistrate Judge