1 2 3 4 5	ROBIN B. JOHANSEN, State Bar No. 79084 THOMAS A. WILLIS, State Bar No. 160989 KARI KROGSENG, State Bar No. 215263 REMCHO, JOHANSEN & PURCELL, LLP 201 Dolores Avenue San Leandro, CA 94577 Phone: (510) 346-6200 Fax: (510) 346-6201 Email: rjohansen@rjp.com	
6 7	Attorneys for Defendant CARLOS A. GARCIA	
8 9	KEVIN M. HALL 4626 17th Street San Francisco, CA 94117 Phone: (408) 368-9019 Email: kevinmichaelhall@gmail.com	
10	In Pro Per	
11	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
13		
14	KEVIN M. HALL, an individual,) No.: C 10-03799 RS
15	REVITATION IN HOLVIGUAL,) 110 @ 10 03777 RB
13	D1-1CCC)) DIH E 26(E) DEDODE
	Plaintiff,	RULE 26(F) REPORT
16	Plaintiff, vs.	RULE 26(F) REPORT))
16 17	vs. CARLOS A. GARCIA, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified	RULE 26(F) REPORT)))))
16 17 18	vs. CARLOS A. GARCIA, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District,	RULE 26(F) REPORT)))))))
16 17 18 19	vs. CARLOS A. GARCIA, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified	RULE 26(F) REPORT))))))))))))
16 17 18 19	vs. CARLOS A. GARCIA, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District,	RULE 26(F) REPORT
116 117 118 119 120 121 121 131	vs. CARLOS A. GARCIA, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District,	RULE 26(F) REPORT))))))))))))
16 17 18 19 220 221 222	vs. CARLOS A. GARCIA, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District,	RULE 26(F) REPORT
116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 123 134 145 156	vs. CARLOS A. GARCIA, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District,	RULE 26(F) REPORT
16 17 18 19 20 21 222 223 224	vs. CARLOS A. GARCIA, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District,	RULE 26(F) REPORT
16 17 18 19 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	vs. CARLOS A. GARCIA, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District,	RULE 26(F) REPORT
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	vs. CARLOS A. GARCIA, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District,	RULE 26(F) REPORT
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 224 225 226 227	vs. CARLOS A. GARCIA, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District,	RULE 26(F) REPORT
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	vs. CARLOS A. GARCIA, in his official capacity as Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District,	RULE 26(F) REPORT

RULE 26(F) REPORT – NO.: C 10-03799 RS

2
 3

Pursuant to Rule 26(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the parties to this action submit this report setting forth a discovery plan. The parties have met and conferred in compliance with Rule 26(f).

1. <u>Initial Disclosures</u>

The parties will serve their initial disclosures on the day this report is due. They have further agreed not to produce actual documents at this time but rather to identify any relevant documents by categories. The parties have agreed to a stay of all discovery until the Court issues a ruling on defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings, which is scheduled for hearing on January 6, 2011. The parties have further agreed that if the Court denies the motion for judgment on the pleadings, they will produce documents identified in the initial disclosures 30 days after the Court issues its order.

2. <u>Subjects and Timing of Discovery</u>

The parties have not taken any discovery to date and have agreed to stay all discovery until defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings has been ruled on by the Court. The parties anticipate that if the motion for judgment on the pleadings is denied, there will be only limited discovery taken.

Plaintiff has indicated he will serve discovery requests regarding the Superintendent's process for handling requests under Penal Code section 626.9, his understanding of what purpose the school zone serves and his response to gun violence in or around the schools, and documents related to these topics. Defendants anticipate taking discovery regarding plaintiff's purported need for an exemption under Penal Code section 626.9.

The parties agree to the following discovery deadlines, assuming the Court rules on the motion for judgment on the pleadings by January 31, 2011. The parties reserve their right to propose alternative dates if resolution of the motion takes longer than that.

- a. Discovery may be conducted February 1 through May 31, 2011;
- b. Discovery cut-off will be June 1, 2011;
- c. Deadline to designate any expert witnesses: June 16, 2011;
- d. Dispositive motions to be filed by September 1, 2011.

Case3:10-cv-03799-RS Document33 Filed12/30/10 Page3 of 3

1 The parties believe that because discovery will be limited, there is no need to conduct it 2 in phases. 3 3. Disclosures or discovery of electronically stored information 4 SFUSD has taken steps to preserve any electronic information that relates to the 5 plaintiff's request, and that is identified in defendant's initial disclosures. 6 4. Claims of privilege 7 The parties agree that if either party inadvertently produces otherwise privileged 8 material, the other party will not claim that the production itself waived the privilege. 9 5. **Limitations of discovery** 10 As set forth above, the parties have agreed to stay discovery until the Court rules on 11 defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings. The parties do not anticipate the need for further 12 restrictions of discovery at this time. 13 6. Any other orders 14 The parties have not agreed to any further orders with respect to discovery. 15 16 Dated: December 30, 2010 Respectfully submitted, 17 REMCHO, JOHANSEN & PURCELL, LLP 18 19 20 Attorneys for Defendant Carlos A. Garcia 21 22 Dated: December 30, 2010 23 24 Kevin M. Hall 25 26 In Pro Per (00134372) 27 28

2

RULE 26(F) REPORT - NO.: C 10-03799 RS