

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

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

JANE DOE and ANNE RASKIN,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO, et al.,

Defendants.

NO. C10-04700 TEH

ORDER FOR FURTHER
DOCUMENTATION

On April 4, 2012, on the second day of the jury trial held in this case, Lawrence Hecimovich, counsel for Defendants, was ordered to show cause why sanctions should not be imposed for his inappropriate questioning of Plaintiff Anne Raskin during cross-examination.

Mr. Hecimovich was required to file any written response to this order by noon on Friday, April 6, 2012. Mr. Hecimovich responded in the form of a letter, which he filed on April 6, 2012. In his letter, he made reference to a case in which he engaged in a nearly identical line of questioning of a plaintiff, and in which the line of questioning had been allowed over opposing counsel's objection.

Mr. Hecimovich provided the name of this case in his letter, albeit with some measure of uncertainty: he cites the case, noting it was his only prior jury trial, as *Hsu (?) v. Bank of America*. He provides no case number or specific date for the case, only the year, 2001.

Because of this lack of specificity, the Court has no means of accessing the records from this case, nor of referring to, or relying on, this ruling in evaluating the presently pending order to show cause.

The Court wishes to further examine the state court proceedings cited by Mr. Hecimovich. Therefore, the Court hereby ORDERS Mr. Hecimovich to file a transcript of

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1 the relevant portion of the state court proceedings in the *Hsu* (?) case with this Court on or
2 before **Monday, May 14, 2012.**

3

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5

6 Dated: 5/4/12



THELTON E. HENDERSON, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28