

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 10-cv-02946-RBJ-MJW

BARBARA J. REMUND,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 14 IN THE COUNTY OF ADAMS & STATE OF COLORADO,
RAY MONDRAGON, in his individual capacity, and
WESLEY PAXTON, in his individual capacity,

Defendant(s).

MINUTE ORDER

Entered by Magistrate Judge Michael J. Watanabe

It is hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Response to Defendant Adams County School District No. 14's Motions to Withdraw Motion to Quash and for a Court Order Rendering Court's Prior Minute Order (ECF No. 64) Moot (**docket no. 71**) is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff's Response and Objections to Defendant School District's Motion to Withdraw Defendants [sic] Motion to Quash and Request to Moot the Court's Order of 2/24/12 (docket no. 75) has been considered by the court.

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant Adams County School District No. 14's Motion to Withdraw Motion to Quash Subpoena (**docket no. 67**) is **GRANTED** finding good cause shown. Defendant Adams County School District No. 14's Motion to Quash Subpoena (**docket no. 53**) is **WITHDRAWN**. Defendant Adams County School District No. 14 has provided to Plaintiff a copy of the subject Settlement Agreement pursuant to the protective order previously entered into in this case. See paragraph 8 in docket no. 66.

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant Adams County School District No. 14's Motion for Court Order Rendering Court's Prior Minute Order (ECF No. 64) Moot (**docket no. 69**) is **GRANTED**, noting this court's ruling above on Defendant Adams County School District No. 14's Motion to Withdraw Motion to Quash Subpoena (docket no. 67).

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Compliance with Subpoena Duces Tecum (**docket no. 56**) is **MOOT** and therefore **DENIED**. Defendant Adams County School District No. 14 has provided to Plaintiff a copy of the subject

Settlement Agreement pursuant to the protective order previously entered into in this case. See paragraph 8 in docket no. 66.

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendant Adams County School District No. 14's Motion for Protective Order (**docket no. 58**) is **DENIED** for the following reasons.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) states, *in pertinent part*, that for good cause, a court may issue a protective order regarding discovery to protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense. See also Rohrbough v. Harris, 549 F.3d 1313, 1321 (10th Cir. 2008). Furthermore, Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1) permits discovery only of relevant information, and the discovery must appear reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Murphy v. Deloitte & Touche Group Ins. Plan, 619 F.3d 1151, 1163 (10th Cir. 2010). Here, I find that topics 9 and 10, in Plaintiff's Second Amended Notice, are relevant under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). I further find that topics 9 and 10 are both reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Lastly, I find that the "last five years" time frame [i.e., 2004-2009] for such information concerning topics 9 and 10 is relevant to Plaintiff's theory of the case as outlined on pages 2 - 4 of the subject motion (docket no. 58) and is not unduly burdensome.

Date: March 15, 2012
