



(PS) Martin v. City of Vallejo

2015 | Cited 0 times | E.D. California | August 28, 2015

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LEON JEROME MARTIN,

Plaintiff, v. CITY OF VALLEJO, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:14-cv-0554 DAD PS

ORDER

This matter came before the court on August 14, 2015, for the hearing of motion to compel. Attorney Kelly Trujillo appeared on behalf of the defendants and plaintiff

Leon Jerome Martin appeared on his own behalf. After hearing argument, defendants were directed to conduct further inquiry into various issues and file a letter with the court addressing whether defendants have produced all documents responsive to plaintiff's discovery requests. (Dkt. No. 76.) On August 21, stating that the Court consider modifying

hearing. (Dkt. No. 77.) However, plaintiff's requests are appropriately brought in the form of a

motion noticed for hearing before the undersigned in compliance with the Local Rules. 1 On August 26, 2015, all responses as was discussed at the August 14,

2015 hearing, defendants state that they have produced the relevant investigative report to plaintiff, that the investigation into the Deocampo incident occurred more than ten years prior to the incident at issue and that, while Id. at 1-2.)

Accordingly, upon consideration of the arguments on file and those made at the hearing, and for the reasons set forth on the record at that hearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. July 22, 2015 motion to compel (Dkt. No. 65) is granted in part and denied in part; 2. Within seven days of the date of this order defendants shall produce to plaintiff a log identifying being brought as a motion noticed for hearing before the undersigned in compliance with the Local Rules. Dated: August 28, 2015



(PS) Martin v. City of Vallejo

2015 | Cited 0 times | E.D. California | August 28, 2015

DAD:6 Ddad1\orders.consent\martin0554.oah.081415.docx

1 With regard to plaintiff's request that the City return witness and travel fees in connection with witnesses who were not required to appear at the August 14, 2015 hearing, the court would encourage the City to do so voluntarily without the need for a motion. The court made clear prior to hearing that no live testimony would be taken and that no witnesses should appear.

