

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

8 SARAH KIM,

No. C 08-5565 SI

9 Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
REQUEST FOR DISCOVERY**

10 v.

11 INTERDENT INC., *et al.*,

12 Defendants.
13 _____/

14
15
16 In a letter filed August 17, 2010, plaintiff seeks an order compelling defendant to produce a copy
17 of the Interim Settlement Agreement between Interdent and its insurer “not as a matter of discovery, but
18 in aid of settlement.” Docket No. 172 at 2. In addition, plaintiff requests that the Court order Interdent
19 to allow plaintiff’s counsel (or persons with an information technology background) to conduct a limited
20 search of Interdent’s backup tapes and disks, at plaintiff’s expense, “again not as a matter of discovery,
21 but in aid of settlement.” *Id.* In an order filed August 11, 2010, the Court denied plaintiff’s motions
22 to compel, as a matter of discovery, the production of the Interim Settlement Agreement, as well as the
23 backup tapes and disks.

24 Defendant objects that plaintiff’s requests are an “attempted end run” around the Court’s August
25 11, 2010 discovery order, and that plaintiff has not articulated any reason why these materials might be
26 germane to settlement. The Court agrees. For all of the reasons set forth in the August 11, 2010 order,
27 plaintiff is not entitled to this discovery. The fact that plaintiff now wishes to have these materials for
28 settlement does not alter the Court’s analysis as to whether defendant is required to produce, or

1 otherwise make available, the discovery sought. Plaintiff's motion is DENIED. (Docket No. 172).

2

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4

5 Dated: September 1, 2010

6



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28