

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

JULIE CAMPANELLI, et al.,)	
)	
Plaintiff(s),)	No. C 08-1862 BZ
)	
v.)	
)	SECOND DISCOVERY ORDER
THE HERSHEY COMPANY,)	
)	
Defendant(s).)	
)	
_____)	

The Court has reviewed Docket No. 111 and 112. The Court is unwilling to alter the present briefing and certification schedule. Nor, based on this record, is the Court willing to preclude Hershey from relying on any of the documents produced on May 28, 2010. It is not clear why the plaintiffs allowed this document production to take so long. At the same time, it is difficult to believe that the 622,000 pages could not have been produced earlier. Just reacting to the example cited by defendant in the penultimate paragraph of its letter, it is not clear why, if Hershey was willing to produce documents back to April 2004, it did not do so while it was disputing with plaintiff whether to extend that date to

1 January 2003. In any event, in the interest of expeditiously
2 resolving the class certification issues, the motion will
3 proceed as scheduled and plaintiff may move to strike any
4 documents that Hershey actually relies on in its opposition
5 and that plaintiffs believe were produced late. The Court
6 will then determine, if necessary, whether the late production
7 of those documents somehow violated Hershey's discovery
8 obligations.

9 Dated: June 11, 2010

10 
11 _____
12 Bernard Zimmerman
13 United States Magistrate Judge

14 G:\BZALL\BZCASES\CAMPANELLI V. HERSHEY\DISC ORD 2.wpd

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28