

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTOPHER OTEY,

No. C 12-5524 JST (MEJ)

Plaintiff,

DISCOVERY ORDER
RE: DKT. NO. 112

v.

CROWDFLOWER, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Before the Court is the parties' joint discovery dispute letter, filed June 13, 2013. Dkt. No. 112. The letter concerns CrowdFlower's third-party subpoenas to three Requesters seeking "records reflecting the dates and times spent performing tasks through [AMT] or other similar such providers, including a description of the task(s) performed." *Id.* at 7. For the reasons stated in the Court's April 11, 2013 Order, Plaintiff's other employment or receipt of other income is irrelevant to the question of whether Plaintiff was Defendants' employee or whether he was an independent contractor. *See* Order at 2:19-3:7, Dkt. No. 85. Accordingly, Plaintiff's request for a protective order is GRANTED. The third party Requesters need not respond to Defendants' subpoenas because they are not likely to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence.

IT IS SO ORDERED

Dated: June 24, 2013



Maria-Elena James
United States Magistrate Judge