

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

JOHN BARKER,
Plaintiff,
v.
INSIGHT GLOBAL, LLC, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [5:16-cv-07186-BLF](#) (HRL)

**ORDER RE DEFENDANTS' MOTION
FOR CLARIFICATION**

Re: Dkt. No. 91

This court recently issued its order deciding Discovery Dispute Joint Report #2. The court now addresses defendant's so-styled Motion for Clarification of that order. Plaintiff opposes the motion on both procedural and substantive grounds. The court doubts that the order needs clarifying. However, to move things along:

1. The court intended to deny any production of telephone logs.
2. The order in question required production of text messages that "constitute, state, discuss, mention, allude to, or reference" certain specified activities with respect to employment at Beacon Hill or defendant. Guided by what seems to be nothing more than wishful thinking, the defendant urges an interpretation that is NOT limited to text messages that are cabined by the definition. As far as the court is concerned, the order means what it says, and defendant's proposed "clarification" would be a dramatic


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

departure from what the court intended.

3. The court intended to deny reopening any depositions.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 2, 2017



HOWARD R. LLOYD
United States Magistrate Judge