

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

RAJA KANNAN,
Plaintiff,
v.
APPLE INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. [17-cv-07305-EJD](#) (VKD)

**ORDER RE DISCOVERY DISPUTE RE
PLAINTIFF'S RULE 30(B)(6) NOTICE,
TOPIC 1**

Re: Dkt. No. 153, 158

Further to this Court's order of October 22, 2019 (Dkt. No. 155), the Court has reviewed the excerpts from the deposition of Moazam Raja identified by the parties and the statement filed by defendant Apple Inc. (Dkt. No. 158).

It appears from those materials that Apple does not any additional information about the reasons Apple cancelled plaintiff Raja Kannan's bonus and stock award during the period of time just prior to his transfer to Mr. Kotni's group. Accordingly, the Court denies Mr. Kannan's motion to compel further discovery on this point from Apple.

With respect to Mr. Kannan's request that Apple be precluded from offering any evidence not yet produced regarding the reasons it cancelled this bonus and/or stock award and that the Court determine that this event is evidence of discrimination against Mr. Kannan, Mr. Kannan may only obtain such relief from the presiding judge in this action. However, as Apple has not timely produced this information in discovery, Apple risks being precluded from using evidence about the reasons it cancelled the bonus and/or stock award, at trial or for any other purpose.

///

///

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 28, 2019


VIRGINIA K. DEMARCHI
United States Magistrate Judge