

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
7

8 JAMES JENKINS, et al.,

No. C -08-03401-EMC (EDL)

9 Plaintiff,

**ORDER REGARDING REQUEST FOR  
FURTHER DEPOSITION OF PHILLIP  
ALLMAN**

10 v.

11 CITY OF RICHMOND,

12 Defendant.  
13 \_\_\_\_\_/

14 Defendant has filed two almost identical requests to take a second deposition of Plaintiff  
15 Threats' expert Phillip Allman "on all changes made to his reports and the impact those changes  
16 have had on his expert opinion" due to an amended expert report produced on July 6, 2012. See  
17 Dkt. #424, 426. Plaintiff Threats agrees that a continued deposition of Mr. Allman is appropriate, so  
18 long as it is limited to the new information in the amended report and the manner in which the new  
19 information has affected the expert's analysis, conclusions and findings. Therefore, Defendant's  
20 request for a second deposition of Mr. Allman is GRANTED, but the deposition is limited to the  
21 new information and opinions contained in the amended report.

22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23  
24 Dated: July 19, 2012

*Elizabeth D. Laporte*

ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE  
United States Magistrate Judge