

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE MICHAEL E. HEGARTY

Civil Action No. 12-cv-01483-REB-MEH  
Courtroom Deputy: Cathy Coomes

Date: September 11, 2012  
**FTR – Courtroom A501**

ELIZABETH WOJDACZ,

*Pro Se*

Plaintiff,

vs.

COLORADO SPRING CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT,  
BRIAN GRADY,  
JOHN IRELAND,  
PATRICK MILLER,  
PENROSE ST. FRANCIS HEALTHCARE,  
GARY LEE NORMAN,  
MICHAEL J. DUNCAN, and  
CLIFF HUDSON,

Erik Lamphere (by phone)

Michael Watts

Kimberly DeLine

Defendants.

---

**COURTROOM MINUTES/MINUTE ORDER**

---

**TELEPHONIC MOTIONS HEARING and SCHEDULING CONFERENCE**

**Court in session: 2:05 p.m.**

Court calls case. Appearances of *pro se* Plaintiff and counsel for Defendants.

Discussion regarding setting deadlines and entering the Scheduling Order submitted by Defendants.

THE FOLLOWING WILL CONFIRM THE ACTIONS TAKEN AND DATES SET AT THE SCHEDULING CONFERENCE HELD THIS DATE:

- **Rule 26(a)(1) Disclosures: September 24, 2012**
- **Joinder of Parties/Amendment of Pleadings: October 25, 2012**
- **Discovery Deadline: June 1, 2013**
- **Dispositive Motion Deadline: July 1, 2013**
- **Initial Rule 26(a)(2) Disclosures: April 1, 2013**
- **Rebuttal Rule 26(a)(2) Disclosures: May 1, 2013**
- Each party group will be allowed five (5) experts absent leave of court.
- Plaintiff will be allowed 50 interrogatories, 50 Requests for Admissions, and 25 Requests

for Production of Documents.

- Defendants will be allowed 50 interrogatories, 50 Requests for Admissions, and 25 Requests for Production of Documents.
- Written discovery shall be served no later than 33 days prior to the close of discovery.

Discussion regarding Defendants recently served but have not entered an appearance.

Plaintiff is sworn and questioned by the Court.

- ORDERED:**
1. Plaintiff shall contact Ms. DeLine or Mr. Watts by telephone once a week on Monday between 12:00 p.m. (noon) and 2:00 p.m. to discuss the status of the case.
  2. Plaintiff shall keep the Court and Defendants advised of any change of addresses.

Argument and discussion regarding Plaintiff's Opposed (sic) Motion to Produce Home Address of City Defendants (Doc. #37, filed 8/27/12); Plaintiff's Opposed Motion to Vacate Status Report Regarding Proposed Scheduling Order; Scheduling Order; and Courtroom Minutes/Minute Order Due to Fraud Upon the Court by Officers of the Court (Doc. #39, filed 8/27/12); and Plaintiff's Opposed Motion for Trinity Hearing (Doc. #35, filed 8/27/12).

- ORDERED:**
1. Plaintiff's Opposed (sic) Motion to Produce Home Address of City Defendants (Doc. #37, filed 8/27/12) is DENIED as stated on the record.
  2. Plaintiff's Opposed Motion to Vacate Status Report Regarding Proposed Scheduling Order; Scheduling Order; and Courtroom Minutes/Minute Order Due to Fraud Upon the Court by Officers of the Court (Doc. #39, filed 8/27/12) is DENIED as stated on the record.
  3. The Court defers ruling on Plaintiff's Opposed Motion for Trinity Hearing (Doc. #35, filed 8/27/12) at this time to allow Mr. Lamphere time to file a response to the motion.

Discussion regarding the pending Motion to Dismiss, the lack of a Certificate of Review, RICO statutes, and Plaintiff's claims.

**Court in recess: 3:05 p.m. (Hearing concluded)**

**Total time in court: 1:00**