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

HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

CYNTHIA FAJARDO,

Plaintiff,

v.

PIERCE COUNTY, a political subdivision of the State of Washington; and PIERCE COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, a department of Pierce County,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:08-cv-05136-RBL

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Defendants' Response [Dkt. #50] to Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration [Dkt. #45] of the Court's Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Compel. [Dkt. #44]. In its Request for Response [Dkt. #50], the Court made a provisional determination that information located in the "Source" column of the document "Chronology #2" would not need to be produced by Plaintiff. Pursuant to Local Rule CR 7(h), the Court requested Defendants' file a response by July 29, 2009 should they object to the Court's proposed resolution of the matter.

In their Response, the Defendants' argue that the Court should reaffirm the findings of its Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Compel. [Dkt. #44]. Specifically, Defendants request that the Court require Plaintiff to produce all information contained in "Chronology #2" including the information located in the "Source Column," which this Court provisionally determined did not need to be produced. [Dkt. #49].

ORDER

Page - 1

The Court finds the Defendants' arguments unpersuasive and orders "Chronology #2" to be disclosed with all information contained in its "Source Column" redacted without exception. Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART consistent with the Court's conclusions in its Order Requesting Response. [Dkt. #49]. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated this 30th of July, 2009. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

ORDER