

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
EUREKA DIVISION**

DANIEL CANADAY, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COMCAST CORPORATION, et al

Defendants.

Case No.: 4:15-cv-04648-JSW

JASON WILLIAMS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COMCAST CORPORATION, et al

Defendants.

Case No.: 4:15-cv-04732-JSW

LAMBERTO VALENCIA, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COMCAST CORPORATION, et al

Defendants.

Case No.: 4:15-cv-04771-JSW

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

JEFFREY COLEMAN, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COMCAST CORPORATION, et al

Defendants.

Case No.: 4:15-cv-04782-JSW

RICHARD NELSON, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COMCAST CORPORATION, et al

Defendants.

Case No.: 4:15-cv-04793-JSW

CALEB DUBOIS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COMCAST CORPORATION, et al

Defendants.

Case No.: 4:15-cv-04809-JSW

GREGORY PETERS, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

COMCAST CORPORATION, et al

Defendants.

Case No.: 4:15-cv-04869-JSW

1 LUPE LANDIN, JR. and EDUARDO
2 MURILLO,

3 Plaintiffs,

4 v.

5 COMCAST CORPORATION, and
6 COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,
7 INC.,

8 Defendants.

Case No. 4:16-cv-04174-JSW

9 CORY BARRETT HALL,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 COMCAST CORPORATION, and
13 COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,
14 INC.,

15 Defendants.

Case No. 4:16-cv-004175-JSW

16 FRANCISCO FLORES and ANTHONY
17 BUSTOS-CABRERA,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20 COMCAST CORPORATION, and
21 COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,
22 INC.,

23 Defendants.

Case No. 4:16-cv-04176-JSW

24 JOSEPH JOSHUA DAVIS, et al.

25 Plaintiffs,

26 v.

27 COMCAST CORPORATION, and
28 COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,
INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 4:16-cv-04177-JSW

JAMES K. GRIMES and CARLOS
RAMOS,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 4:16-cv-04178-JSW

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

v.
COMCAST CORPORATION, and
COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,
INC.,
Defendants.

STEPHEN MCBRIDE, et al.
Plaintiffs,
v.
COMCAST CORPORATION, and
COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,
INC.,
Defendants.

Case No. 4:16-cv-04179-JSW

LAWRENCE ELKINS, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
COMCAST CORPORATION, and
COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,
INC.,
Defendants.

Case No. 4:16-CV-04180-JSW

HERNAN PAEZ, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
COMCAST CORPORATION, and
COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,
INC.,
Defendants.

Case No. 4:16-cv-04181-JSW

KRIS COOK, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
COMCAST CORPORATION, and
COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,
INC.,

Case No. 4:16-cv-04182-JSW

1 Defendants.
2 KEVIN HUFFMAN, et al.,
3 Plaintiffs,
4 v.
5 COMCAST CORPORATION, and
6 COMCAST OF CONTRA COSTA,
7 INC.,
8 Defendants.

Case No. 4:16-cv-04183-JSW

**[PROPOSED] ORDER re PRODUCTION
OF PRIVILEGE LOG AND
DISCOVERY DISPUTES**

9
10 Two motions filed by Defendant Comcast Cable Communication Management, LLC
11 (“Comcast”) (erroneously sued as Comcast Corporation and Comcast of Contra Costa, Inc.) to
12 compel discovery were heard on October 4, 2016, before the Honorable Nandor J. Vadas. The
13 first motion pertained to section III of Defendant’s discovery brief of July 25, 2016, seeking
14 production of a privilege log, with regard to which this Order shall apply to all the Canaday
15 related cases. The second motion concerned Defendant’s discovery letter brief of September
16 16, 2016, which is decided by this Order in its entirety and applies to the following actions:
17 *Davis v. Comcast Corporation*, Case No. 4:16-cv-04177-JSW, *Paez v. Comcast Corporation*,
18 Case No. 4:16-cv-0-4181-JSW, *Cook v. Comcast Corporation*, Case No. 4:16-cv-04182-JSW,
19 and *Huffman v. Comcast Corporation*, Case No. 4:16-cv-04183-JSW.

20 Patrick Terry, Esq., and Arlo Uriarte, Esq., appeared on behalf of all Plaintiffs. Stephen
21 Tausch, Esq. and Fred Alvarez, Esq., appeared on behalf of Defendant Comcast. After
22 considering the parties’ positions, and counsel’s arguments, the Court hereby Orders as
23 follows:

24 With respect to Roman Numeral III, of the Defendant’s motion filed July 25, 2016,
25 2016, seeking to compel a privilege log, the Court Orders that, with respect to all the *Canaday*
26 related cases now pending in the Northern District of California, Defendant’s motion to compel
27 a privilege log is denied. The Court denies Defendant’s motion without prejudice to
28 Defendant’s renewing the motion in the event that Plaintiffs assert the relevance of notice of

1 decertification in subsequent motions or Judge White, in subsequent rulings, concludes that
2 notice of decertification is relevant to determining the tolling period.

3 With respect to Defendant's motion filed on September 16, 2016, the court orders that
4 with respect to issue 1, Plaintiffs Cayenne, Souza and Agundez shall respond, which may
5 include any objections, to outstanding discovery, or determine whether to seek dismissal of
6 their actions, by October 14, 2016. The Court further orders that, with respect to issue 2
7 regarding RFP No. 27, Plaintiffs in *Huffman, Cook, Paez* and *Davis* are to provide responses,
8 which may include objections, by October 14th. The court further orders that, with respect to
9 issue 3, Defendant's request for amended responses is denied.
10

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12
13
14 DATED: October 18, 2016


15 Honorable Nandor J. Vadas
16 United States Magistrate Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28