

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

KEITH GARLOUGH, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
TRADER JOE'S COMPANY,
Defendant.

Case No. 15-cv-01278-TEH

**ORDER RE: AUGUST 3, 2015
HEARING**

The parties shall come to the August 3, 2015 hearing prepared to address the following questions.

For Plaintiffs

1. Is it Plaintiffs' position that this matter could not have initially been filed in the Central District?
2. How would it be convenient for putative class members to maintain this case in the Northern District, given the number of stores in Southern California?
3. Does Plaintiffs' offer to travel to the Central District to take the depositions of Trader Joe's Rule 30(b)(6) witnesses extend to non-party witnesses residing in the Central District?
4. At what point does a witness's cost of travel become a "substantial expense?"

For Defendant

1. Is Defendant aware of any former Regional Vice Presidents, store Captains, or comparable former Trader Joe's employees who participated in or executed the Refresh and who currently reside in Northern California?

United States District Court
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

2. Is it Defendant’s position that this matter should proceed in the Central District even if class certification is ultimately denied?

3. At what point does a witness’s cost of travel become a “substantial expense?”

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 07/29/15



THELTON E. HENDERSON
United States District Judge