

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
Senior District Judge Richard P. Matsch**

Date: January 9, 2012
Courtroom Deputy: J. Chris Smith
FTR Technician: Kathy Terasaki

Civil Action No. 10-cv-01081-RPM

RONALD R. PACE,

Trocom E. Williams

Plaintiff,

v.

WOODMEN HILLS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT,
a political subdivision of the State of Colorado,
LARRY BISHOP, and
JANICE L. PIZZI

William T. O’Connell, III
Evan D. Ela

Defendants.

COURTROOM MINUTES

Hearing on Pending Motions

2:30 p.m. Court in session.

Court’s preliminary remarks.

2:34 p.m. Mr. O’Connell identifies issues that have been resolved with respect to defendant’s motion to compel [61].

Mr. O’Connell states the remaining outstanding requests concern issues with respect to damages.

2:43 p.m. Argument by Mr. Williams.

Court states the deposition of Lindquist is permitted for the limited purpose as stated on record. Plaintiff’s waiver contention is denied.

3:04 p.m. Rebuttal argument by Mr. O’Connell.

3:10 p.m. Further argument by Mr. Williams.

Court states the Rule 30(b)(6) deposition of Babgate Capital (bond co.)is permitted for the limited purpose as stated on record.

Further argument by Mr. O’Connell.

January 9, 2012
10-cv-01081-RPM

Argument by Mr. Ela.

ORDERED: Defendants Woodmen Hills Metropolitan District, Larry Bishop And Janice Pizzi's Motion to Compel Plaintiff's Supplemental Responses to Defendants' First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents [61], is resolved by agreement.

ORDERED: Plaintiff's Motion to Quash or Motion for Protective Order Narrowing Subpoena for School Records Pursuant to Rule 45(c)(3)(A)(III) [62], motion terminated as ruling deferred.

ORDERED: Motion to Quash Subpoena to Produce Documents, r in the Alternative, Request for *in Camera* Inspection of Documents and Entry of Protective Order [65], is resolved by Court's instruction.

ORDERED: Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Deposition Testimony of Geoffrey Lindquist and Motion to Compel Production of Documents from Susemihl, Mcdermott, and Cowan under Rule 37(a) [66], is granted in part and denied in part as stated on record.

ORDERED: Plaintiff's Second Motion to Extend Discovery Deadline [67], is granted and the discovery deadline is extended to February 10, 2012.

ORDERED: Plaintiff shall respond to defendant's motion for summary judgment [75] on or before March 2, 2012.

3:22 p.m. Court in recess.

Hearing concluded. Total time: 52 min.