

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

6 GREGORY P. BARNES, ET AL.,

No. 3:12-cv-01334-CRB

7 Plaintiffs,

**ORDER RE DEFENDANT'S MOTION
FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY
JUDGMENT AND LEAVE TO
RESPOND TO PLAINTIFFS'
OBJECTIONS**

8 v.

9 THE HERSHEY COMPANY,

10 Defendant.

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

11
12 Now before the Court is Defendant The Hershey Company's ("Hershey") motion for partial
13 summary judgment in an age discrimination suit. Rule 56(d) provides that "[i]f a nonmovant shows
14 by affidavit or declaration that, for specified reasons, it cannot present facts essential to justify its
15 opposition, the court may: (1) defer considering the motion or deny it; (2) allow time to obtain
16 affidavits or declarations or to take discovery; or (3) issue any appropriate order." Fed. R. Civ. P.
17 56(d). Here, the Malloy Declaration (dkt. 177) and the record before the Court meet the
18 requirements of Rule 56(d).

19 On September 5, 2014, two days after Plaintiffs filed their opposition (dkt. 176) to the
20 present motion, Magistrate Judge Cousins issued an order resolving discovery disputes between the
21 parties. Discovery Order (dkt. 182). Magistrate Judge Cousins' order compels Hershey to
22 produce a corporate designee for deposition on topics concerning "realignments, restructurings,
23 reorganizations, or reductions in force that affected the CSE or CDM position between 2009 and
24 2013" and "plans or goals to sever CSEs and CDMs in 2009 through 2011." Discovery Order at 3-
25 4, 6. The order further compels Hershey to answer Plaintiffs' interrogatories numbers 11 and 12, see
26 Sixth Discovery Brief (dkt. 165 at 2), and to produce requested documents numbers 15 and 17, see
27 id., regarding realignments, restructurings, or reorganizations, and personnel files. Discovery Order
28 at 7-10. The parties were also ordered to meet and confer on additional discovery matters and to

1 submit further discovery letter briefs. See generally id.; see also Status Report (dkt. 194).

2 The discovery sought was held to be “reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of
3 admissible evidence as to whether Hershey engaged in group termination[,]” which is a central
4 question at issue in Hershey’s motion for summary judgment. Id. The discovery process should
5 therefore proceed in line with Judge Cousins’ order before a fair determination of the issues raised at
6 the summary judgment stage is made.

7 Therefore, the hearing on the motion scheduled for October 17, 2014 is VACATED and the
8 motion is DENIED without prejudice. Accordingly, Plaintiffs’ objections to Hershey’s reply
9 evidence (dkt. 193) and Hershey’s motion for leave to respond (dkt. 195) are DENIED AS MOOT.

10

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12

13

14

15 Dated: October 6, 2014

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23


24

25

26

27

28



CHARLES R. BREYER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE