

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
For the Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTOPHER OTEY	No. C 12-5524 CRB (MEJ)
Plaintiff,	DISCOVERY ORDER
v.	RE: DKT. NO. 72
CROWDFLOWER, INC., et al.,	
Defendants.	

The Court is in receipt of the parties' joint discovery dispute letter, filed March 14, 2013. Dkt. No. 72. The letter relates to 203 Requests for Admission and 139 Requests for Production that Plaintiff has served on Defendants. Defendants have responded to 86 of Plaintiff's RFAs and agreed to respond to 43 of Plaintiff's RFPs by April 8, 2013. However, as Defendants have filed a motion to bifurcate, which seeks to preliminarily focus discovery and motion practice in this action on the issue of whether Defendants were Plaintiff's "employer" for purposes of the FLSA and Oregon law, Defendants request entry of a protective order from responding to the remainder of Plaintiff's RFAs and RFPs until after Judge Breyer rules on the bifurcation/stay motion. In addition, Defendants argue that Plaintiff has already filed a motion for conditional collective-action certification and there is therefore no purpose, at this stage, in conducting class discovery. Upon review of the parties' letter, the Court agrees that it is prudent to limit discovery until such time as Judge Breyer has determined the bifurcation motion. Accordingly, Defendants' request for a protective order is GRANTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED

Dated: March 15, 2013



Maria-Elena James
United States Magistrate Judge