UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

Case No. 02-cv-05849 PJH (NC)

ORDER MODIFYING **DISCOVERY PROCEDURES** AND DENYING MOTION FOR **SANCTIONS**

Re: Docket Nos. 627, 631, 634, 641

In an attempt to address the parties' cross-complaints about the process for scheduling depositions in this case, the Court ordered the parties to propose a new process for noticing future depositions. Dkt. No. 631. The Court also ordered Plaintiffs' counsel to provide to Taco Bell all dates on which they are available for depositions for the remainder of 2011, and it ordered Taco Bell to do the same in addition to providing to Plaintiffs the name of each witness Taco Bell intends to depose. *Id.* The parties submitted a joint statement containing the requested information. Dkt. No. 634. Based on this statement, the Court orders the following:

Case No. 02-cv-05849 PJH (NC) ORDER re DISCOVERY PROCEDURES AND MOTION FOR SANCTIONS

27

28

5

1. Process for Noticing Future Depositions

Depositions may be scheduled only for days on which both Plaintiffs' counsel and Taco Bell's counsel are available. As to deposition notices for class members or proposed class members, the noticing party must provide advance notice to opposing counsel of the proposed deposition before serving a subpoena.

The parties must conduct any noticed deposition within thirty miles of the deponent's home address, unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

Any party that instructs a witness not to appear at a properly noticed deposition may be sanctioned by this Court.

2. Plaintiffs' List of Potential Trial Witnesses

Because the number of potential trial witnesses in this case is large, and because the time for taking depositions is limited, Plaintiffs must file and serve an updated list of expected trial witnesses by November 18, 2011.

3. Taco Bell's List of Deponents

No more than seven calendar days after Plaintiffs file their updated list of trial witnesses, Taco Bell must provide to Plaintiffs a list of persons it intends to depose, and the proposed dates and locations of the depositions.

4. Plaintiffs' Motion for Sanctions Against Taco Bell

Plaintiffs moved for sanctions against Taco Bell under 28 U.S.C. § 1927 and Civil Local Rule 1-4. Dkt. No. 627. The Court granted in part Plaintiffs' motion on October 5, 2011, by granting Plaintiffs' request to quash a deposition noticed by Taco Bell, but it reserved ruling on the remaining issues asserted in the motion, namely whether Taco Bell should be sanctioned for allegedly violating Civil Local Rule 30-1 by noticing depositions without first conferring with Plaintiffs about the scheduling of such depositions. Dkt. No. 641.

The Court finds that counsel for both parties contributed equally to the disagreement about scheduling depositions. Plaintiffs' motion for sanctions with respect to Taco Bell's alleged violation of Civil Local Rule 30-1 is therefore DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: November 9, 2011

NATHANAEL M. COUSINS United States Magistrate Judge