

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
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KIMBERLY BOHNERT,
Plaintiff,
v.
THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP
OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [14-cv-02854-WHO](#)

**ORDER REGARDING NUMBER OF
DEPOSITIONS**

Re: Dkt. No. 61

The parties are having a dispute over the number of depositions that may be taken by plaintiff. While I am not averse to allowing more than ten depositions in a case as potentially fact intensive as this one, I agree with defendants that I need a better record on which to order them. If the parties are unable to resolve this dispute on their own, plaintiff should provide me, by May 15, 2015, with a list of the witnesses it is deposing and would like to depose and for each witness, a very brief description of the expected areas of testimony, the expected length of testimony (full day, half day, or less), and the agreed-upon dates of deposition (if any). Defendant may respond by May 20, 2015 to explain why the testimony would be cumulative or unnecessary.

I encourage grouping deponents on a single day or days for efficiency's sake if appropriate. I will take the amount of time requested for depositions into account along with the number of depositions. I remind the parties that summer vacation is fast-approaching for school personnel, as is the fact discovery cutoff date. I do not intend to extend the dates previously set in this matter, I do expect timely responses to communications by counsel, and I will not accept excuses concerning scheduling depositions that I require.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 8, 2015


WILLIAM H. ORRICK
United States District Judge