

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  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PAUL HUPP,	)	Civil No. 12cv0492 GPC(RBB)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b>ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND</b>
	)	<b>DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFF'S</b>
v.	)	<b>EMERGENCY EX PARTE MOTION TO</b>
	)	<b>QUASH RAYMOND WETZEL SUBPOENAS</b>
SAN DIEGO COUNTY, SAN DIEGO	)	<b>[ECF NO. 133]</b>
POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

On July 23, 2013, Plaintiff Paul Hupp submitted a Notice of Emergency Ex Parte Motion and Emergency Ex Parte Motion to Quash Raymond Wetzel Subpoena; the Motion addresses two subpoenas for records [ECF No. 133]. The Court stayed any production of records under the subpoenas and set a briefing schedule for Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion. (See Mins., July 24, 2013, ECF No. 134.) Plaintiff's Supplemental Brief Supporting Emergency Ex Parte Motion to Quash Raymond Wetzel Subpoena [ECF No. 136] was filed nunc pro tunc to July 24, 2013; it adds a third subpoena to Hupp's Motion to Quash. On August 7, 2013, Defendants City of San Diego and Raymond Wetzel filed their Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Quash Subpoena [ECF No. 137]. Plaintiff's Reply was filed nunc pro tunc

1 to August 15, 2013 [ECF No. 144]. For the following reasons,  
2 Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.

3 **I. BACKGROUND**

4 On February 28, 2012, Plaintiff Paul Hupp, proceeding pro se,  
5 commenced this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Compl. 1, ECF  
6 No. 1.) Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint was filed on August  
7 28, 2012 [ECF No. 64], naming as Defendants San Diego County, City  
8 of San Diego, City of Beaumont, James Patrick Romo, Raymond Wetzel,  
9 William Kiernan, Peter Myers, and Joseph Cargel. (Third Am. Compl.  
10 1, ECF No. 64.) Hupp's action arises from his contempt of court  
11 charges and conviction in San Diego Superior Court in 2011. (See  
12 id. at 4-5, 7-8.)

13 Plaintiff alleges that in November 2010, Jeffrey Freedman<sup>1</sup>  
14 obtained a three-year restraining order against Hupp in San Diego  
15 Superior Court. (Id. at 4.) In July 2011, Freedman brought  
16 contempt charges against Hupp for sending letters to Freedman in  
17 violation of the restraining order. (Id. at 5.) Defendant William  
18 Kiernan, an attorney from the San Diego County Office of the  
19 Assigned Counsel, was appointed to represent Hupp. (Id.) Hupp  
20 alleges that Kiernan failed to investigate the case or request  
21 discovery, failed to communicate with Hupp, and that his lack of  
22 preparation amounted to ineffective assistance of counsel. (Id. at  
23 6-7.) Plaintiff also claims that Defendants performed DNA and  
24 fingerprint tests on the letters and envelopes allegedly sent by  
25 him, but Defendants wrongfully withheld this exculpatory forensic  
26  
27

---

28 <sup>1</sup> All claims against Defendant Freedman in this case were  
dismissed on June 4, 2012 [ECF No. 35].

1 evidence until February 2012, when they produced the evidence in  
2 another court case. (Id. at 11-12.)

3 Plaintiff claims that he was wrongfully convicted based on  
4 insufficient evidence and sentenced to twenty-five days in custody  
5 and a \$5,000 fine. (Id. at 7.) Hupp alleges that the trial judge  
6 improperly denied him custody credits under the California Penal  
7 Code section 4019. (Id. at 8.)

8 On January 3, 2012, Hupp reported to the San Diego Sheriff's  
9 Department to serve his twenty-five day sentence. (Id. at 9.)  
10 Plaintiff claims that he told the Sheriff's Department personnel  
11 that they had to apply his custodial credits under California Penal  
12 Code, but they refused to apply the section 4019 credits. (Id.)  
13 Hupp also claims that he was denied access to the law library and  
14 prevented from filing legal papers. (Id. at 10-11.)

15 Plaintiff alleges that Defendants never disclosed to him that  
16 the San Diego District Attorney's office, San Diego Police  
17 Department, Deputy District Attorney Romo, and Defendant Wetzel  
18 were investigating and assisting Deputy Attorney General Dracar  
19 prosecute the November 2011 civil contempt proceedings against  
20 Hupp. (Id. at 7, 11.) Hupp also claims that Defendants failed to  
21 disclose exculpatory DNA and fingerprint evidence obtained from the  
22 letters Freedman received in violation of Plaintiff's due process  
23 rights under Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83 (1963). (Id. at 11-  
24 12.)

25 These allegations form the basis of Plaintiff's claims for  
26 violation of civil rights, conspiracy to withhold Brady evidence,  
27 interference with legal mail and free speech, unlawful detention,  
28 intentional infliction of emotional distress, as well as gross

1 negligence in the hiring, training, supervision, and retention of  
2 prosecutors and peace officers. (See id. at 12-29.) Hupp claims  
3 that Defendants' actions caused him emotional and psychological  
4 injuries, embarrassment, humiliation, shame, fright, fear, and  
5 grief. (Id. at 14, 20-21.) In connection with his claims,  
6 Plaintiff seeks compensatory and punitive damages exceeding  
7 \$75,000, as well as declaratory and injunctive relief. (Id. at 35-  
8 37.)

## 9 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

10 Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion seeks to quash three subpoenas  
11 served by Defendant Wetzel on the custodian of records at the San  
12 Diego Sheriff's Department. (See Pl.'s Ex Parte Mot. Quash Raymond  
13 Wetzel Subpoena 1,<sup>2</sup> ECF No. 133; Pl.'s Supplemental Br. Supporting  
14 Ex Parte Mot. Quash Raymond Wetzel Subpoena 2, ECF No. 136.) Hupp  
15 argues that the subpoenas are overly broad, lack relevance, and the  
16 records sought are not material. (Pl.'s Ex Parte Mot. Quash  
17 Raymond Wetzel Subpoena 8, ECF No. 133.) He also claims that the  
18 subpoenas constitute "an extreme invasion into the personal privacy  
19 of Plaintiff." (Id. at 9.)

20 A party may serve a subpoena commanding a nonparty "to produce  
21 documents, electronically stored information, or tangible things."  
22 Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(a)(1)(C). The subpoena is subject to the  
23 relevance requirements set forth in Rule 26(b) and may command the  
24 production of documents which are "nonprivileged" and "relevant to  
25 any party's claim or defense." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). Relevant  
26 information includes matter "reasonably calculated to lead to the

---

27  
28 <sup>2</sup> Because Hupp's Emergency Ex Parte Motion is not  
consecutively paginated, the Court will cite to it using the page  
numbers assigned by the Court's ECF system.

1 discovery of admissible evidence." Id. The information sought  
2 need not be admissible at trial as long as it appears reasonably  
3 calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Id. A  
4 "relevant matter" under Rule 26(b)(1) is any item that "bears on,  
5 or that reasonably could lead to other matter that could bear on,  
6 any issue that is or may be in the case." Oppenheimer Fund, Inc.  
7 v. Sanders, 437 U.S. 340, 351 (1978).

8 On a timely motion, a subpoena may be quashed if it "requires  
9 disclosure of privileged or other protected matter, if no exception  
10 or waiver applies . . . ." Fed. R. Civ. P. 45 (c)(3)(A)(iii).

11 A person withholding subpoenaed information under a  
12 claim that it is privileged or subject to protection as  
trial-preparation material must:

13 (i) expressly make the claim; and

14 (ii) describe the nature of the withheld documents,  
15 communications, or tangible things in a manner that,  
16 without revealing information itself privileged or  
protected, will enable the parties to assess the claim.

17 Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(d)(2)(A). Rule 26(b) requires essentially the  
18 same information from a party who withholds information otherwise  
19 discoverable due to a claim of privilege. Fed. R. Civ. P.  
20 26(b)(5)(A). Any objection to a subpoena must be served on the  
21 party or attorney requesting the discovery "before the earlier of  
22 the time specified for compliance or 14 days after the subpoena is  
23 served." Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(c)(2)(B).

24 Neither Plaintiff nor Defendants address what law should be  
25 applied to Hupp's claims. Generally, in federal question cases,  
26 privileges asserted in response to discovery requests are  
27 determined under federal law, not the law of the forum state. Fed.  
28 R. Evid. 501; United States v. Zolin, 491 U.S. 554, 562 (1989).

1 Federal Rule of Evidence 501 also states that "in a civil case,  
2 state law governs privilege regarding a claim or defense for which  
3 state law supplies the rule of decision." Fed. R. Evid. 501.

4 In his Complaint, Hupp alleges both a federal civil rights  
5 claim and state law claims. "[I]n federal question cases . . . in  
6 which state law claims are also raised . . . , any asserted  
7 privileges relating to evidence relevant to both state and federal  
8 claims are governed by federal common law." 6 James Wm. Moore et  
9 al., Moore's Federal Practice § 26.47[4], at 26-334.1 (3d ed.  
10 2013); see Fitzgerald v. Cassil, 216 F.R.D. 632, 635 (N.D. Cal.  
11 2003) (applying federal law of privilege to alleged violations of  
12 Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. § 3604, and various state law claims).  
13 Similarly, in Stallworth v. Brollini, 288 F.R.D. 439, 442 (N.D.  
14 Cal. 2012), the court applied federal common law to resolve claims  
15 of privilege in an action alleging § 1983 and state law claims.  
16 Accordingly, federal common law will be applied to Hupp's claims.  
17 "State law may provide guidance, but it is not the law of the  
18 circuit." Gorton v. Bick, Case No. 1:05-CV-00354-LJO-DLB PC, 2010  
19 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 107783, at \*5 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 28, 2010) (citing  
20 Green v. Baca, 226 F.R.D. 624, 643-44 (C.D. Cal. 2005)).

21 California law recognizes a constitutional right to privacy  
22 in an individual's medical history. See Pettus v. Cole, 49 Cal.  
23 App. 4th 402, 440, 57 Cal. Rptr. 2d 46, 72 (1996) ("[I]t is well  
24 settled that the zone of privacy created by [article I, section 1  
25 of the California Constitution] extends to the details of a  
26 patient's medical and psychiatric history.") (citing Cutter v.  
27 Brownbridge, 183 Cal. App. 3d 836, 842, 228 Cal. Rptr. 545, 549  
28 (1986), and Wood v. Superior Court, 166 Cal. App. 3d 1138, 1147,

1 212 Cal. Rptr. 811 (1985)); Bd. of Med. Quality Assurance v.  
2 Gherardini, 93 Cal. App. 3d 669, 678, 156 Cal. Rptr. 55, 60 (1979)  
3 (“[F]undamental to the privacy of medical information ‘is the  
4 ability to control [its] circulation[.]’”) (alteration in original)  
5 (citation omitted).

6 But this constitutional right to privacy is not absolute and  
7 must be balanced against a compelling public interest, such as “the  
8 legitimate interests of real parties in preparing their defense.”  
9 Jones v. Superior Court, 119 Cal. App. 3d 534, 550, 174 Cal. Rptr.  
10 148, 158 (1981); see Ragge v. MCA/Universal Studios, 165 F.R.D.  
11 601, 604 (C.D. Cal. 1995) (discussing documents in employee’s  
12 personnel files). Thus, a California plaintiff who seeks recovery  
13 for mental injuries “unquestionably waive[s] [the] physician-  
14 patient and psychotherapist-patient privileges as to all  
15 information concerning the medical conditions which [he has] put in  
16 issue . . . .” Britt v. Superior Court, 20 Cal. 3d 844, 849, 574  
17 P.2d 766, 768-69, 143 Cal. Rptr. 695, 697 (1978).

18 In Carrig v. Kellogg USA Inc., Case No. C12-837RSM, 2013 U.S.  
19 Dist. LEXIS 13560, at \*5 (W.D. Wash. Jan. 30, 2013), the court  
20 discussed federal law of waiver applicable to physician-patient and  
21 psychotherapist-patient privileges.

22 District courts have adopted different approaches to  
23 determine whether the patient has waived his or her  
24 psychotherapist-patient privilege. Under the broad  
25 approach, . . . a simple allegation of emotional distress  
26 in a complaint constitutes waiver. Under the narrow  
27 approach, . . . there must be an affirmative reliance on  
28 the psychotherapist-patient communications before the  
privilege will be deemed waived.

There is a middle ground . . . . Under this approach,  
courts have generally found a waiver when the plaintiff  
has done more than allege “garden-variety” emotional  
distress.

1 Id. at \*5-6 (internal citations omitted). This Court agrees that a  
2 waiver of privacy rights to mental health records should occur only  
3 if a plaintiff asserts "more than a garden-variety claim of  
4 emotional distress." Turner v. Imperial Stores, 161 F.R.D. 89, 97  
5 (S.D. Cal. 1995) (applying middle approach); see Fitzgerald v.  
6 Cassil, 216 F.R.D. at 633, 638-39 (adopting narrow approach and  
7 finding no waiver of privacy when plaintiff did not allege "cause  
8 of action for intentional or negligent infliction of emotional  
9 distress" or "specific psychiatric injury or disorder or unusually  
10 severe emotional distress extraordinary in light of the  
11 allegations").

### 12 III. DISCUSSION

13 Defendant City of San Diego issued three subpoenas to the San  
14 Diego Sheriff's Department requesting production of various records  
15 related to Plaintiff Paul Hupp, booking number 12500589. (Decl.  
16 Milligan Opp'n Pl.'s Mot. Quash Subpoena Attach. #2, at 3,<sup>3</sup> ECF No.  
17 137.) The first subpoena is addressed to the custodian of records,  
18 San Diego County Sheriff's Department, 9621 Ridgehaven Ct., San  
19 Diego, CA 92123, and seeks records and video recordings, namely  
20 "[c]omplete records from the first date to the present, including  
21 but not limited to any records/documents that may be stored  
22 digitally and/or electronically: records in your possession,  
23 custody, or control pertaining to this person." (Id. at 3-4.) The  
24 second subpoena is directed to the custodian of records, San Diego  
25 County Sheriff's Department, located at 5255 Mt. Etna Dr., San

26

27

---

28 <sup>3</sup> Because the attachment to the Declaration of Milligan is not  
consecutively paginated, the Court will cite to it using the page  
numbers assigned by the Court's ECF system.



1 Diego, CA 92117, and seeks "photographs," more specifically  
2 described in the attachment as follows:

3 Complete photographs from the first date to the present,  
4 including but not limited to any records/documents that  
5 may be stored digitally and/or electronically: any and  
6 all photographs or duplicate laser copies thereof  
(photocopies are not acceptable) in your possession,  
custody, or control (either received by you or taken by  
you).

7 Booking #12500589.

8 (Id. at 7-8.) The third subpoena is addressed to the custodian of  
9 records, San Diego County Sheriff's Medical Records Department,  
10 5530 Overland Ave., Bldg. 5530, Ste. 370, San Diego, CA 92123, and  
11 requests the production of "Billing Records; Photographs; Medical  
12 Records; Mental Health Records; Dental Records; X-Rays/MRIs/CT  
13 scans; Records; [and] Video Recording(s)" (Id. at 10.) The  
14 attachment to the subpoena provides an exhaustive, albeit at times  
15 repetitious, clarification of this request:

16 Complete medical records, billing records, and radiology  
17 images from the first date of treatment to the present,  
18 including but not limited to any records/documents that  
19 may be stored digitally and/or electronically: documents,  
20 medical reports, doctor's entries, nurse's notes,  
21 progress reports, cardiology reports, radiology reports,  
22 x-ray reports, MRI reports, lab reports, pathology  
23 reports, monitor strips, physical therapy records,  
24 case history, emergency records, diagnosis, prognosis,  
25 condition, admit and discharge records, charges, explanation  
26 of benefits, payments, adjustments, write-offs, balances due,  
27 itemized billing charges, X-rays, MRI's, CT's, myelograms,  
28 tomograms, MRA's PET scans, CAT scans, fluoroscopy, documents  
including sign-out sheets or communications which demonstrate  
that any items were checked out from or removed from your  
facility, radiology reports, x-ray reports, MRI reports, CT  
reports, myelogram reports, cardiology reports, and any other  
radiology reports. All approved radiology images must be  
produced on film or on a DICOM compliant CD only. Prior to  
duplication, please provide a breakdown of all radiology  
images in your possession, custody, or control. All emails  
between physicians and the patient regarding physical  
complaints, symptoms, and treatment, including secure  
messages.

1 Complete dental records from the first date of treatment  
2 to the present, including but not limited to any  
3 records/documents that may be stored digitally and/or  
4 electronically: dental records/reports, radiology  
5 reports, notes, correspondence, prescription slips,  
6 telephone messages, diagnostic reports, and itemized  
7 statements of the billing charges. All emails between  
8 physicians and the patient regarding physical complaints,  
9 symptoms, and treatment, including secure messages.

10 Complete mental health records from the first date of  
11 treatment to the present, including but not limited to  
12 any records/documents that may be stored digitally and/or  
13 electronically: medical records pertaining to any and all  
14 care, treatment, and/or examinations, notes, records, and  
15 reports of psychotherapy diagnosis, evaluation, and  
16 treatment, and any other records relating to mental  
17 health. All emails between physicians and the patient  
18 regarding physical complaints, symptoms, and treatment,  
19 including secure messages.

20 Booking #12500589

21 To include any and all records from San Diego County Jail  
22 Medical Records; William Didier, Chief, Medical Records;  
23 and 8525 Gibbs Dr., Ste. 303, San Diego, CA 92123.

24 (Id. at 11.)

25 Plaintiff objects to the production of his records on the  
26 grounds that the subpoenas are overly broad, do not seek relevant  
27 evidence, invade his privacy, and are protected from disclosure by  
28 the physician-patient privilege. (Pl.'s Mem. P. & A. Supp. Ex  
Parte Mot. Quash 9-10, ECF No. 133.) Hupp argues that the  
information requested is not relevant to any defense Wetzel might  
have. Plaintiff contends that Defendants are conducting a  
"‘fishing expedition’ into the personal, private and confidential  
life of Plaintiff in order to harass and intimidate him . . . ."

29 (Id. at 9.) Hupp points out that although he expressed the  
30 concerns about the scope of the information sought in the  
31 subpoenas, Defendants have not agreed to limit their request. (Id.  
32 at 10-11.) Plaintiff therefore seeks to quash the subpoenas in

1 their entirety, and asks the Court to sanction Defendant Wetzel.  
2 (Id. at 11-12.)

3 In response, Defendants City of San Diego and Raymond Wetzel,  
4 aka Charlie Wetzel, argue that "Plaintiff has placed his medical  
5 records at issue[,] " which justifies the intrusion into his  
6 privacy. (Defs.' Opp'n Mot. Quash 2, ECF No. 137.) They argue  
7 that Hupp's medical records are relevant to whether his alleged  
8 emotional distress may have been caused by something other than  
9 Defendants' actions, such as any pre-existing medical or  
10 psychological issues. (Id. at 2-3.) Defendants claim that  
11 Plaintiff waived any privacy rights he normally would have by  
12 alleging emotional distress, and fairness dictates they be allowed  
13 access to Hupp's medical records. (Id. at 3-4.) They acknowledge  
14 that the subpoenas seek a "variety of different categories of  
15 documents, but nothing that is unusual in a personal injury case."  
16 (Id. at 4.) Defendants also point out that because some of the  
17 events alleged in the pleadings occurred while Hupp was housed at  
18 the San Diego County Jail, any medical treatment he received while  
19 there is relevant to the case. (Id.) Finally, they argue that any  
20 privacy concerns can be properly addressed by a narrowly-drawn  
21 protective order. (Id. at 5.)

22 Plaintiff replies that to the extent privacy is waived by  
23 bringing the suit, the waiver applies to the matters directly  
24 related to the litigation. (Pl.'s Reply 2, ECF No. 144.) Hupp  
25 argues that Defendants failed to show a compelling interest in  
26 accessing his complete medical records and photographs. (Id. at 2-  
27 3.) He also claims that he "has not waived any privilege by  
28 placing his medical condition at issue . . . ." (Id. at 4.) Hupp

1 contends that because Defendants fail to show any relevance of his  
2 medical records to this litigation, the Court should grant his  
3 request to quash the subpoenas. (Id. at 4-6.)

4 To the extent Plaintiff objects to the subpoenas on the  
5 relevance ground, the Court overrules his objection in part. In  
6 his fifth cause of action, Hupp alleges a claim for intentional  
7 infliction of emotional distress against Defendants San Diego  
8 Police Department and Wetzel. (Third Am. Compl. 20-21, ECF No.  
9 64.) Plaintiff contends that Defendants brought civil contempt of  
10 court charges against him with intent to "harass, annoy,  
11 intimidate, incite, threaten and instill fear . . . ." (Id. at  
12 13.) He claims that he "suffered injuries as a proximate cause of  
13 [Defendants]'s actions, including, but not limited to, the  
14 following, to wit: (1) humiliation; (2) loss of liberty; (3)  
15 emotional distress; (4) psychological distress; (5) losses of the  
16 safety, pleasure, joy and vitalities of life that are of a  
17 continuing nature." (Id. at 14.) He seeks over \$75,000 in  
18 compensation for emotional damages that he allegedly suffered  
19 because of Defendants' actions. (Id. at 35.)

20 By alleging a claim for intentional infliction of emotional  
21 distress and seeking damages for mental and emotional injuries,  
22 Hupp is seeking more than garden-variety emotional distress  
23 damages. Plaintiff has placed at issue the extent of his emotional  
24 distress and therefore waived his privacy rights with respect to  
25 his medical records. A plaintiff who raises issues concerning his  
26 mental or emotional condition and seeks damages for mental or  
27 emotional injuries waives the right to privacy with respect to  
28 those issues. See Schwenk v. City of Alameda, No. C-07-00849 SBA

1 (EDL), 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18836, at \*2-3 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 11,  
2 2011) (denying motion to compel release of mental health records  
3 where plaintiff claimed garden variety emotional distress damages  
4 and did not assert claims for intentional or negligent infliction  
5 of emotional distress); EEOC v. Vail Corp., Civil Action No. 07-cv-  
6 02035-REB-KLM, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 86046, at \*7 (D. Colo. Oct. 2,  
7 2008) (finding that mental condition was not "in controversy"  
8 absent a separate claim for intentional infliction of emotional  
9 distress or "a damages claim for severe and emotionally devastating  
10 harm") (citation omitted). Hupp's waiver, however, only applies to  
11 the records that are clearly relevant and directly related to his  
12 mental and emotional injuries. See, e.g., In re Lifschutz, 2 Cal.  
13 3d 415, 427, 467 P.2d 557, 564, 85 Cal. Rptr. 829, 836 (1970)  
14 ("[T]he patient-litigant exception of section 1016 of the  
15 [California] Evidence Code compels disclosure of only those matters  
16 which the patient himself has chosen to reveal by tendering them in  
17 litigation.").

18 In addition to Hupp's mental health records, Defendants'  
19 subpoenas seek production of his dental records, billing  
20 statements, radiology and lab reports, and many other items of  
21 information not directly related to his claim of intentional  
22 infliction of emotional distress or any other claim. To the extent  
23 they argue that complete medical records are discoverable because  
24 Plaintiff's alleged emotional injury may have been caused by  
25 something other than Defendants' actions, their speculation is not  
26 sufficient to warrant disclosure.

27 In this case, Hupp has placed his psychological condition at  
28 issue only to the extent it was caused by Defendants' actions.

1 Unlike a typical personal injury case, Plaintiff does not allege a  
2 physical injury caused by Defendants that required medical  
3 treatment. Instead, he claims that Defendants' conduct in bringing  
4 civil contempt of court charges violated his civil rights and  
5 caused him emotional distress. As currently stated, Defendants'  
6 discovery requests are overbroad. In opposing the Ex Parte Motion  
7 to Quash, they fail to explain how Hupp's entire medical record is  
8 relevant to the claims in this case.

9 Plaintiff has not waived his privacy rights with regard to his  
10 complete medical record by bringing a claim for intentional  
11 infliction of emotional distress. Britt, 20 Cal. 3d at 863-64, 574  
12 P.2d at 779, 143 Cal. Rptr. at 707. Additionally, Hupp has made a  
13 timely objection to such a disclosure by bringing this Ex Parte  
14 Motion. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(c)(2)(B). Therefore, although  
15 Defendants are entitled to reasonable discovery that will show the  
16 nature and possible causes of Hupp's emotional injury, their  
17 request for the array of medical records, doctors' entries and  
18 reports, nurses' notes, messages, images and video records is  
19 overbroad and must be limited to the information proximately  
20 related to the causes of action alleged.

21 Accordingly, Defendants' first subpoena addressed to the San  
22 Diego County Sheriff's Department, 9621 Ridgehaven Ct., San Diego,  
23 CA 92123, seeking records and video recordings, is limited to  
24 records reflecting Hupp's mental health condition. Similarly,  
25 production of any photographs under Defendants' second subpoena  
26 directed to the custodian of records at the 5255 Mt. Etna Dr., San  
27 Diego, CA 92117, is hereby limited to photographs of Plaintiff that  
28 reflect his mental health condition, if any. Defendants' third

1 subpoena addressed to San Diego County Sheriff's Medical Records  
2 Department, 5530 Overland Ave., Bldg. 5530, Ste. 370, San Diego, CA  
3 92123, which seeks "Billing Records; Photographs; Medical Records;  
4 Mental Health Records; Dental Records; X-Rays/MRIs/CT scans;  
5 Records; [and] Video Recording(s)" is modified as follows: (1) the  
6 request in the subpoena is stricken except the words "Mental Health  
7 Records"; (2) the first two paragraphs of Attachment A are stricken  
8 in their entirety. The remaining paragraph three in Attachment A  
9 is modified as follows:

10 Complete mental health records from the first date of  
11 treatment to the present, including but not limited to  
12 any mental health records/documents that may be stored  
13 digitally and/or electronically: medical records  
14 pertaining to any ~~and all~~ mental health care, treatment,  
15 and/or examinations, notes, records, and reports of  
16 psychotherapy diagnosis, evaluation, and treatment, and  
17 any other records relating to mental health. All emails  
18 between physicians and the patient regarding ~~physical or~~  
19 mental complaints, symptoms, and treatment, including  
20 secure messages.

21 Booking #12500589.

22 To include any and all records from San Diego County Jail  
23 Medical Records; William Didier, Chief, Medical Records;  
24 and 8525 Gibbs Dr., Ste. 303, San Diego, CA 92123.


#### 25 IV. CONCLUSION

26 For the reasons stated above, the Court **GRANTS** the Ex Parte  
27 Motion to Quash the subpoenas to the extent they seek records not  
28 related to Hupp's mental or emotional injuries. The Court **DENIES**  
the Ex Parte Motion to Quash the subpoenas in any other respect.  
Any production under the subpoenas must be consistent with this

1 Order and limited to Plaintiff's mental health records as discussed  
2 herein.

3 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

4 Dated: September 25, 2013

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruben B. Brooks  
United States Magistrate Judge

5  
6 cc: Judge Curiel  
7 All Parties of Record  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28