

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

District Court
of California

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

DAVID MOORE,
Plaintiff,
v.
GILEAD SCIENCES, INC.,
Defendant.

No. C 07-03850 SI

**ORDER RE: INDEPENDENT
PSYCHIATRIC EXAMINATION OF
PLAINTIFF**

GILEAD SCIENCES, INC.,
Defendant.

United States District
For the Northern District
14 On December 7, 2011, defendant Gilead Sciences, Inc. (“Gilead”) filed a discovery dispute with
15 the Court regarding an independent psychiatric examination of plaintiff David Moore. In it, Gilead
16 states that Moore recently identified a neuropsychiatrist whom he plans to call at trial “regarding issues
17 of damages including, but not limited to, plaintiff’s neuropsychological assessment, emotional distress,
18 pain and suffering, and psychological and/or psychiatric injury suffered by Plaintiff based on the events
19 of this case and Plaintiff’s medical history.” Doc. 118, Ex. A, at 2. In response, Gilead is requesting
20 the Court to compel Moore to submit to an independent mental examination by a forensic psychiatrist
21 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 35 (“Rule 35”). Moore filed an opposition to Gilead’s request on December
22 20, 2011. Moore argues that Gilead has not provided sufficient detail about its proposed examination
23 for the Court to fulfill the requirements of any Rule 35 order, and, furthermore, that fact discovery has
24 closed and defendant has not provided any argument that a mental exam would be expert discovery
25 subject to a different deadline than fact discovery.

26 The Court finds that Gilead has made a sufficient showing of good cause as required by Rule
27 35(a)(2)(A) to order an independent mental exam of Moore. However, Moore is correct that a Rule 35
28 order “must specify the time, place, manner, conditions, and scope of the examination, as well as the

1 person or persons who will perform it.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 35(a)(2)(B). Gilead has not provided the Court
2 with sufficient information about the proposed exam to satisfy these requirements. The parties are
3 therefore ORDERED to meet and confer to discuss the specifics of the mental exam. If the parties fail
4 to agree on those specifics, they may submit their dispute to the Court.

5

6

7

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9
10 Dated: December 23, 2011

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Susan Illston
SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge