Doc. 70

(1) there is an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the moving party presents 2 newly discovered or previously unavailable evidence; or (3) the motion is 3 necessary to correct manifest errors of law or fact upon which the judgment is 4| based. Turner v. Burlington N. Santa Fe R. Co., 338 F.3d 1058, 1063 (9th Cir. 5 2003). Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26(c) and 37(a)(5) govern protective orders. Rule 37(a)(5) provides that where a motion for a protective order is denied, 8 the Court 9 must, after giving an opportunity to be heard, require the movant, the 10 attorney filing the motion, or both to pay the party or deponent who 11 opposed the motion its reasonable expenses incurred in opposing the 12 motion, including attorney's fees. But the court must not order this 13 payment if the motion was substantially justified or other 14 circumstances make an award of expenses unjust. 15 Here, the Court expressed its intent to award Plaintiff's counsel fees after it denied 16 Defendant's motion for a protective order. However, at that time, the Court was 17 unaware of the circumstances underlying the necessity of Defendant's motion. 18 Having reviewed the record and the submissions of the parties, the Court believes 19 that an award of expenses is unjust and that Defendant's motion was substantially 20 justified. Accordingly, the Court grants Defendant's motion for reconsideration 21 and denies Plaintiff's counsel's request for fees. 22 | // 23 | // 24||// 25 // 26 | // 27 28

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR

RECONSIDERATION +2

1. Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration Re: Sanctions, ECF No. 40, is GRANTED.

2. Plaintiff's counsel's request for fees regarding Defendant's Motion for 5 Protective Order Re: Deposition of Robert Painter, ECF No. 26, is **denied**.

IT IS SO ORDERED. The District Court Clerk is hereby directed to enter this Order and provide copies to counsel.

DATED this 21st day of May 2018.



Stanley A. Bastian United States District Judge