

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 08-cv-01693-MSK-KLM

CHRISTINA ANN FOURHORN,  
MUSE JAMA,  
JOSE ERNESTO IBARRA,  
DENNIS MICHAEL SMITH,  
SAMUEL POWELL MOORE, and  
DEDE DAVIS,

Plaintiffs,

ANTONIO CARLOS SANCHEZ,

Plaintiff-Intervenor,

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER,  
MARK DALVIT, a detective with the Denver Police Department, in his individual capacity,  
CURT PETERSON, an officer with the Denver Police Department, in his individual capacity,  
JOHN BISHOP, an officer with the Denver Police Department, in his individual capacity,  
ALAN SIRHAL, a Denver Sheriff Department deputy, in his individual capacity,  
CHOICE JOHNSON, an officer with the Denver Police Department, in his individual capacity,  
ANDREW RICHMOND, an officer with the Denver Police Department, in his individual capacity,  
PAUL ORTEGA, a sergeant with the Denver Sheriff Department, in his individual capacity,  
JOHN DOE 1, a Denver Police Department officer, whose identity is unknown, in his individual capacity, and  
JOHN DOE 2, a Denver Police Department officer, whose identity is unknown, in his individual capacity,

Defendants.

---

MINUTE ORDER

---

ENTERED BY MAGISTRATE JUDGE KRISTEN L. MIX

This matter is before the Court on **Defendants' Partially Unopposed Motion to Resolve Motion for Protective Order Regarding Plaintiffs' Excessive Interrogatories**

[Docket No. 256; Filed August 21, 2009] (the “Motion”). Despite the cumbersome title, the Court interprets the Motion to be a request to withdraw Defendants’ Motion for Protective Order Regarding Plaintiffs’ Excessive Interrogatories [Docket No. 183] (“Motion No. 183”). Although the Motion purports to be “partially unopposed” due to unidentified language used by Defendants to which Plaintiffs object, the parties agree that Motion No. 183 is now moot. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY **ORDERED** that the Motion is **GRANTED**. The Court accepts the parties’ agreement – namely that Defendants will answer interrogatory nos. 36, 37 and 47 from Plaintiffs’ Eighth Set of Discovery Requests (“Requests”) and Plaintiffs will withdraw their remaining interrogatories propounded pursuant to the Requests – and considers the discovery dispute to be resolved.

IT IS FURTHER **ORDERED** that Motion No. 183 is deemed to be **WITHDRAWN**.

Dated: August 24, 2009