

1

2

3

4

5

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

6

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION,
 DAVID REGAN and ELISEO MEDINA, as trustees for
 SEIU UNITED HEALTHCARE WORKERS-WEST
 and fiduciaries of the SEIU UNITED HEALTHCARE
 WORKERS-WEST AND JOINT EMPLOYER
 EDUCATION FUND, SEIU UNITED HEALTHCARE
 WORKERS-WEST, an unincorporated association and
 fiduciary of the SEIU UNITED HEALTHCARE
 WORKERS-WEST AND JOINT EMPLOYER
 EDUCATION FUND, and REBECCA COLLINS, as a
 participant in the SEIU UNITED HEALTHCARE
 WORKERS-WEST AND JOINT EMPLOYER
 EDUCATION FUND,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SAL ROSELLI, JORGE RODRIGUEZ, JOAN EMSLIE,
 JOHN BORSOS, JOHN VELLARDITA, GABE KRISTAL,
 PAUL KUMAR, MARTHA FIGUEROA, BARBARA
 LEWIS, PHYLLIS WILLETT, DANIEL MARTIN, LAURA
 KURRE, RALPH CORNEJO, WILL CLAYTON, GLENN
 GOLDSTEIN, FRED SEAVEY, MARK KIPFER, AARON
 BRICKMAN, IAN SELDEN, GAIL BUHLER, FREJA
 NELSON, ANDREW REID, NATIONAL UNION OF
 HEALTHCARE WORKERS; MARYRUTH GROSS,
 CONNIE WILSON, ARLENE PEASNALL, CHERIE
 KUNOLD, FAYE LINCOLN, and DOES 1 through 100,
 inclusive,

Defendants.

No. C 09-00404 WHA

**ORDER OVERRULING
 PLAINTIFFS'
 OBJECTIONS TO
 MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S
 NOVEMBER 19
 DISCOVERY ORDER**

In this action directed at wrongs allegedly committed by former officers of a parent union before quitting to form a competing union, plaintiffs object to two of the rulings in the November 19 discovery order by Magistrate Judge Maria-Elena James. *First*, plaintiffs object that the order

1 denied in part their motion to compel defendants to produce databases and database source
2 material. Specifically, it required only that defendants disclose “their databases listing NUHW
3 supporters” and not any broader databases or other source material. Plaintiffs also object that the
4 November 19 order required that defendants produce any such databases only to plaintiffs’
5 designated forensic expert, not to plaintiffs or plaintiffs’ counsel.

6 *Second*, plaintiffs object that the November 19 order denied their request to compel
7 defendants to produce past staff lists. In opposing plaintiffs’ request before Magistrate Judge
8 James, defendants asserted that they did not maintain staff lists and therefore had nothing more
9 to produce.

10 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a) provides that a magistrate judge’s nondispositive
11 order must be accepted unless it is “clearly erroneous or is contrary to law.” Plaintiffs do not
12 identify in the November 19 order any specific findings of fact that they assert are clearly
13 erroneous nor any legal conclusions that they assert are contrary to law. They merely ask the
14 Court to substitute its own judgment for that of the magistrate judge. But the reviewing district
15 court is not permitted to simply substitute its judgment. *Grimes v. City and County of San*
16 *Francisco*, 951 F.2d 236, 241 (9th Cir. 1991).

17 Accordingly, plaintiffs’ objections to the November 19 discovery order are **OVERRULED**.
18 The November 19 discovery order is **AFFIRMED**.

19
20 Dated: December 2, 2009.



21 WILLIAM ALSUP
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23
24
25
26
27
28