Bruce W. Kelley 1 Nevada Bar No. 7331 ATKIN WINNER & SHERROD 2 1117 South Rancho Drive 3 Las Vegas, Nevada 89102 Telephone: (702) 243-7000 Facsimile: (702) 243-7059 4 bkellev@awslawvers.com 5 Eron Z. Cannon Nevada Bar No. 8013 6 MCCORMICK, BARSTOW, SHEPPARD, 7 WAYTE & CARRUTH LLP 8337 West Sunset Road, Suite 350 8 Las Vegas, Nevada 89113 (702) 949-1100 Telephone: (702) 949-1101 9 Facsimile: eron.cannon@mccormickbarstow.com 10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 11

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY, ALLSTATE PROPERTY & CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY, ALLSTATE INDEMNITY COMPANY, and ALLSTATE FIRE & CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY,

PETER MARIO BALLE, D.C., SEBASTIAN P. BALLE, M.D., ARTHUR ROSSI, D.C.,

RICHARD CHARETTE, ELITE ATL, LLC., ACCIDENT INJURY MEDICAL CENTER,

INC., ACCIDENT TRIAL LAWYERS, LLC., ACCIDENT TRIAL LAWYERS, INC.,

REAL TIME MARKETING, INC., EXPERT MANAGEMENT, INC., ANDREW TAYLOR,

RAMSEY AND ASSOCIATES, INC., and

DENNIS RAMSEY,

Plaintiffs,

1

19 20

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

26

2728

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 2:10-cv-02205-APG-NJK

ORDER ON PLAINTIFFS' EMERGENCY MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER REGARDING DEFENDANTS' 30(b)(6) DEPOSITION NOTICES

The matter of Plaintiffs' Emergency Motion for Protective Order Regarding Defendants' 30(b)(6) Deposition Notices (#239) came on regularly for hearing on July 12, 2013 before

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

Magistrate Judge Nancy J. Koppe in Courtroom 3D. After reviewing the moving and responsive papers on file as well as entertaining oral argument thereon, the Court made the following rulings:

- 1. Plaintiffs' Motion for Protective Order is denied so long as the Defendants modify all topics to ask generally about the practices, policies and procedures of Allstate as a Company. This would include any policies and procedures that are used in the State of Nevada whether they are Nevada specific or nationwide policies.
- 2. The relevant time frame for the Defendants' inquiry will be from 2004 through 2010.
- 3. Defendants are entitled to ask general policy and procedure questions but specific factual questions that would elicit percipient witness testimony are not appropriate.
- 4. If it is determined that Defendants are seeking policies or procedures that no longer remain in effect or are not relevant to the State of Nevada or the type of claims which are the subject of this litigation, Plaintiffs need not produce any information as to those categories but must so inform the Defendants.
- 5. To the extent that Defendants seek policies and procedures and/or training materials used by claims professionals in Nevada to handle the types of claims involved in the subject litigation, Plaintiffs' Motion for Protective Order is denied to the extent that Defendants narrowly tailor these requests consistent with this Order.
- 6. Plaintiffs' request for protective order of Plaintiffs' financial information sought by Defendants is granted.
- 7. Plaintiffs' request for protective order as to any information contained within Plaintiffs' employees' personnel files or evaluations is also granted
- 8. The Court has determined that any objections to attorney-client privilege and attorney work product privilege with regard to Allstate's investigation in this case are moot as Defendants are only allowed to ask about policies and procedures not what specifically occurred in this case.

11

28

NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge