

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
CIVIL MINUTES - ORDER

SEND

Case No. SACV 03-1611 GLT (ANx)

Dated and filed on: December 20, 2004

Title: Robert Nigg, et al. v. United States Postal Service

Present: **Hon. Arthur Nakazato, United States Magistrate Judge**

DOCKETED ON CHAMBERS - No Appearances)  
DEC 21 2004  
BY [Signature] 040

Melissa Cash  
Deputy Clerk

None  
Court Reporter

**Proceedings:** Plaintiffs' motion to compel defendant to answer interrogatory 2 and produce documents responsive to requests 1-2, 5-6, 9-12, 24-25 ("Motion") [Docket Entry No. 139]

**Rulings:** The Motion is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART (details discussed below).

**Discussion:**

After considering the parties' respective contentions set forth in the Motion's Joint Stipulation ("JS"), the Court rules as follows:

1. Interrogatory No. 2 - To the extent Plaintiffs' seek information relating to Level 14 postal inspectors, Defendant's relevancy objection is sustained and the Motion is denied in part because Plaintiffs have expressly defined postal inspectors similarly situated to themselves as those "classified at the EAS Level-23/ISLE Level-13 or lower. [JS at 2:18-21; 5:8-15.]
2. Document Request Nos. 1 & 2 - To the extent Plaintiffs have specifically identified Policy Updates as responsive information during the Local Rule 37-1 pre-filing conference of counsel, the Motion is granted in part as to these responsive documents because the Court finds Plaintiffs have met their burden of demonstrating Policy Updates are relevant. However, the Motion is denied in part as to National Communications, Division Directives, Division Circulars and ISIIS Instructions and Directives because the Court finds Plaintiffs have not met their burden of showing these requested items are relevant. Accordingly, Defendant's objections to these requested items on the grounds that the requests are vague and ambiguous, overly

146

broad, and unduly burdensome, are sustained.

3. Document Request Nos. 5 & 6: Defendant's objections to these requests as stated are sustained. Further, by failing to identify or explain the relevance of all training handouts, all schedules of training modules or classes, and all management guides, the Court finds these requests remain vague and ambiguous, overly broad and unduly burdensome as stated. Accordingly, the Motion is denied in part as to these requests.
4. Document Request Nos. 9, 10, 11 & 12: Defendant's objections to these requests are sustained, and the Motion is denied in part as to these requests.
5. Document Request Nos. 24 & 25: Defendant's objections to Request No. 24 are sustained, and the Motion is denied in part this request. However, the Court finds documents responsive to Request No. 25 are relevant, therefore, Defendant's objections are overruled as to this request, and the Motion is granted in part as to all non-privileged documents that are responsive to Request No. 25.
6. Production Date: To the extent the Motion has been granted in part as to some of the foregoing requests, Defendant shall produce documents responsive to the requests in question within 20 days of this Order.

cc: JUDGE TAYLOR  
All Parties

Initials of Deputy Clerk 