

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

**\*E-FILED: June 1, 2012\***

NOT FOR CITATION  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

MARY BASICH,

No. C11-04406 EJD (HRL)

Plaintiff,

**ORDER RE DISCOVERY DISPUTE  
JOINT REPORT #5**

v.

**[Re: Docket No. 59]**

PATENAUDE & FELIX, APC. and CAPITAL  
ONE BANK, (USA), N.A.; DOES 1-10,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Mary Basich sues for alleged violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq., the Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681, et seq., and the California Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788, et seq. She claims that defendants improperly attempted to collect a debt from her with respect to a Capital One credit card and invaded her privacy by obtaining her credit report without her permission. Plaintiff says that this is a case of mistaken identity and that she is not the debtor. Reportedly, the debt is owed by one Mary Ryals, who used the alias “Mary Basich.” Plaintiff initially thought Ryals had stolen her identity, but plaintiff says that she no longer believes that to be the case.

Now before this court is the parties’ Discovery Dispute Joint Report (DDJR) #5 in which defendants seek an order compelling plaintiff to produce documents responsive to

1 Request for Production Nos. 3-4, 6-7, and 9-11. In sum, these requests seek documents  
2 supporting or relating to the allegations of the complaint, plaintiff's credit history, and  
3 plaintiff's claimed actual damages. The matter is deemed appropriate for determination without  
4 oral argument. Civ. L.R. 7-1(b). Having considered the parties' respective positions, the court  
5 grants defendants' request.

6 In her discovery responses, plaintiff asserted several objections, but nevertheless agreed  
7 to produce all responsive documents in her possession, custody, or control. No privileges were  
8 asserted. Plaintiff does not offer any argument as to why she should not be required to produce  
9 documents responsive to the requests at issue.<sup>1</sup> And, although plaintiff initially balked at  
10 producing responsive bank statements, she now tells this court that she will do so. Accordingly,  
11 within 7 calendar days from the date of this order, and to the extent she has not already done so,  
12 plaintiff shall produce all documents in her possession, custody, or control responsive to  
13 Request Nos. 3-4, 6-7, and 9-11.

14 SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: June 1, 2012

16   
17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 HOWARD R. LLOYD  
19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>1</sup> Curiously, plaintiff devotes her efforts in DDJR #5 to an explanation as to  
28 why she has not produced documents responsive to Request for Production No. 8, which  
seeks documents reflecting the credit history of Mary Ryals. Defendants having confirmed  
that they are not moving to compel documents responsive to that request, this court will not  
address it.

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

5:11-cv-04406-EJD Notice has been electronically mailed to:  
Balam Osberto Letona    letonalaw@gmail.com  
Candice Lynn Fields    cfields@kmtg.com, lchenknapp@kmtg.com, mmcguire@kmtg.com,  
SRamirez@kmtg.com  
Danielle Renee Teeters    dteeters@kmtg.com, sramirez@kmtg.com  
June D. Coleman    jcoleman@kmtg.com, krockenstein@kmtg.com, lchenknapp@kmtg.com  
Lucius Wallace    luke@hwh-law.com, tammy@hwh-law.com  
Robert David Humphreys    david@hwh-law.com, tammy@hwh-law.com