

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6 SAN JOSE DIVISION
7

8 SANDRA OLSON, et al.,

9 Plaintiffs,

10 v.

11 WORLD FINANCIAL GROUP
12 INSURANCE AGENCY, LLC, et al.,

13 Defendants.

Case No. 24-cv-00477-EJD

**ORDER REGARDING DISCOVERY
DISPUTES**

Re: ECF Nos. 64, 66 (No. 24-cv-0077);
ECF Nos. 186, 211 (No. 24-cv-00480)

14 The Court is in receipt of World Financial Group Insurance Agency, LLC's ("WFG")
15 Motion for Relief from Nondispositive Pretrial Order regarding Magistrate Judge Cousins' May
16 31, 2024 Order. ECF No. 186, No. 24-cv-00480. On July 5, 2024, Eric Olson and Sandra Olson
17 ("the Olsons") filed an opposition to WFG's motion. ECF No. 196, No. 24-cv-00480. The Court
18 is also in receipt of WFG's Administrative Motion to File a Supplemental Brief in Support of its
19 Motion (ECF No. 64, No. 24-cv-00477; ECF No. 211, No. 24-cv-00480), and the Olsons'
20 opposition to that request (ECF No. 63, No. 24-cv-00477). On July 24, 2024, WFG filed a
21 separate motion for relief under Civil Local Rule 72(a) related to Judge Cousins' July 10, 2024
22 Order. ECF No. 66, 24-cv-00477.

23 This Order addresses the above motions.

24 WFG's request to file a supplemental brief is DENIED. WFG contends that new evidence
25 from Mr. Olson's deposition relates to WFG's arguments in its motion for relief that discovery of
26 documents which pre-date Mr. Olson's termination is proportional to WFG's request for
27 injunctive relief. This request should be raised with Judge Cousins in the form of a motion for

28 Case No.: 24-cv-00477-EJD
ORDER REGARDING DISCOVERY DISPUTES

1 leave to file a motion for reconsideration under Civil Local Rule 7-9(b)(1), which governs the
2 procedure when “a material difference in fact or law exists” that may impact a prior ruling. The
3 Court will DENY WFG’s motion for relief regarding Judge Cousins’ ruling on the date range
4 issue without prejudice to file a motion for leave under Civil Local Rule 7-9.¹

5 Regarding the second issue raised by WFG in both of its motions for relief from Judge
6 Cousins’ rulings regarding the designation of certain documents as “Attorneys’ Eyes Only,” the
7 Court is persuaded that an AEO designation may hamper WFG’s ability to prepare for its
8 preliminary injunction motion because it could prevent WFG from evaluating whether and to what
9 extent the documents reflect WFG’s confidential information. However, the Court is cognizant
10 that disclosure of the documents could risk retaliation against current WFG agents identified in the
11 documents. Accordingly, to allow WFG to prepare for its preliminary injunction motion while
12 also ensuring the protection of third parties’ privacy interests, the Court finds that it may be
13 appropriate to de-designate certain AEO documents with redactions to all information that may
14 identify any third parties. Without having the documents at issue before the Court, the Court
15 cannot determine whether all 247 documents should be de-designated, or to what extent the
16 documents should be redacted.

17 The Parties are ORDERED to meet and confer to discuss the timing and procedure for
18 exchanging redacted documents based on the Court’s ruling above. Any dispute regarding the
19 redactions should be brought before Judge Cousins, however the Court instructs the parties to
20 endeavor to resolve disputes over this issue on their own.

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

22 Dated: July 26, 2024



EDWARD J. DAVILA
United States District Judge

23
24
25
26
27 ¹ Civil Local Rule 7-9 typically “does not apply to motions for reconsideration of a Magistrate
28 Judge’s order.” Nevertheless, the Court finds the procedure appropriate under this specific
 circumstance.