

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

CHRISTOPHER CRAIG, et al.,
Plaintiffs,

No. C -11-04219 EDL

ORDER

v.

CITY OF KING CITY, et al.,
Defendants.

On January 8, 2013, the Court held a pretrial conference at which the parties and the Court discussed, among other things, Plaintiff Craig’s claim for violation of the Confidentiality of Medical Information Act, California Civil Code sections 56.10 and 56. 20. The Court requires further information from Plaintiffs about Plaintiff Craig’s remaining claim under section 56.20. Accordingly, no later than January 16, 2013 at noon, Plaintiffs shall inform the Court as to what exactly in Dr. Glick’s report was beyond the scope of Craig’s second release by his attorney. Plaintiffs shall quote specific language from the report, and shall briefly explain why that quoted language went beyond the scope of the release. Plaintiffs shall also address whether he agrees that Plaintiffs’ counsel’s January 3, 2011 release governs the scope of Plaintiff’s authorization under standard agency principles, as it appears to the Court, and not pursuant to California Civil Code sections 56.11(c)(2) and 56.21(c)(2). No later than January 17, 2013 at noon, Defendants shall respond to Plaintiffs’ filing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 14, 2013

Elizabeth D. Laporte
ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
United States Magistrate Judge