2 3 4 5 6 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO 10 Coordination Proceeding Special Title (Rule JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION 11 1550(b)) PROCEEDING NO. 4095 12 FIREARM CASE 13 Including actions: People, et al. v. Arcadia Machine & Tool, Inc., 14 San Francisco Superior Court No. 303753 et al. 15 People, et al. v. Arcadia Machine & Tool, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court No. BC210894 16 17 People, et al. v. Arcadia Machine & Tool, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court No. BC214794 et al. 18 19 PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' PROPOSED PROTECTIVE ORDER 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

1			TABLE OF CONTENTS		
2					
3				Pag	,e
4	I.	INTR	ODUCTION		1
5	II.	ARGU	JMENT		1
6 7		A.	The Party Objecting to Disclosure of Confidential Information to a Person Other than One Originally Allowed under the Protective Order Should Bear the Burden of Preventing Such Disclosure		1
8		B.	This Court Should Adopt Plaintiffs' Proposal That a Document That Has Been Denied Confidential Treatment in Any Other Action or Proceeding Should Be Subject to Disclosure in this Action		
10 11		C.	Defendants' Attempt to Bar Plaintiff's Public Counsel from Access to Confidential Information Should Be Rejected	• .	2
12		D.	Defendant's Proposal to Bar Temporary Employees of Plaintiffs from Having Access to Confidential Documents Is Unnecessary		3
13 14		E.	Defendants' Limitation on the Expert Witnesses to Whom Plaintiffs Can Disclose Confidential Information Is Overly-restrictive and Burdensome		3
15		F.	Plaintiffs' Proposal Allowing Counsel of Record in Similar Litigation Throughout the Country Access to Confidential Information Should Be Adopted		4
17		G.	Defendants' Attempt to Utilize the Protective Order to Bar Admission of Confidential Documents at a Public Trial Should Be Rejected		5
18 19		H.	Defendants' Attempt to Limit Disclosure of Confidential Documents to a Deponent Who Is or Has Been Eligible to Have Access to Confidential Information by Virtue of His or Her Employment Is Unjustified	. (6
20		I.	No Deadline by Which to Contest the Designation of a Document as Confidential Should Be Imposed	. (5
22	III.	CONC	LUSION	. ?	7
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
8					

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendants' proposed protective order is simply too burdensome and will impose restrictions on the parties that are not justifiable. Plaintiffs herewith submit their proposed protective order ("Plaintiffs' Proposed Ord."), which is attached as Exhibit A. In contrast to defendants' proposal ("Defs.' Proposed Ord."), plaintiffs' protective order strikes the appropriate balance between the need for protection and the need for disclosure of confidential information. Therefore, plaintiffs' proposed protective order should be adopted by this Court.

II. ARGUMENT

A. The Party Objecting to Disclosure of Confidential Information to a Person Other than One Originally Allowed under the Protective Order Should Bear the Burden of Preventing Such Disclosure

Both parties' protective orders allow confidential information to be disclosed to certain categories of experts, witnesses and attorneys. Beyond that, plaintiffs propose that a party may seek to disclose confidential information to a person not designated under the protective order if the party believes in good faith that disclosure is necessary to that party's case. Plaintiffs' Proposed Ord., ¶18. Plaintiffs further propose that if the designating party objects, it should file a motion to bar the disclosure. *Id.*

It is well established that the party seeking a protective order bears the burden of establishing good cause for the order. *Stadish v. Superior Court*, 71 Cal. App. 4th 1130, 1145 (1999). Plaintiffs' proposal requiring the designating party to file a motion with the court barring disclosure is entirely consistent with this principle.

Furthermore, defendants' contention that plaintiffs' proposal is burdensome and illogical lacks merit. First, requiring the designating party to file a motion to bar disclosure results in no additional burden because, even under defendants' proposal, the designating party would have to file a responsive motion with the Court setting forth its reasons for nondisclosure. Second, under plaintiffs' proposal, the party seeking disclosure must submit a request to the designating party identifying the name and roles of persons to whom they seek disclosure and the reasons and expected circumstances under which the disclosure shall be made. Plaintiffs' Proposed Ord., ¶18. Once the designating party receives this information, it is in a better position than the party seeking disclosure

- 1

to articulate to the Court why disclosure should be barred. Defendants' proposal requires the party seeking disclosure to engage in guesswork in order to proffer to the Court the supposed reasons for the designating party's objection. This procedure runs contrary to common sense and should be rejected.

B. This Court Should Adopt Plaintiffs' Proposal That a Document That Has Been Denied Confidential Treatment in Any Other Action or Proceeding Should Be Subject to Disclosure in this Action

Defendants claim that plaintiffs propose that a document that has been denied confidential treatment by a trial court in another jurisdiction should, by virtue of that ruling, be denied confidential treatment in another jurisdiction before all challenges and appeals of the trial court's decision have been exhausted. Defs.' Memo at 4. Defendants grossly misconstrue plaintiffs' position.

Where a court has denied confidential treatment to a document, plaintiffs merely seek the right to immediately use that document in another jurisdiction, unless a challenge or appeal of the order of the court who denied confidential treatment to the document is taken. Plaintiffs' Proposed Ord., ¶7. Plaintiffs' proposal recognizes that pending a challenge or appeal, the document mantains its confidentiality. Accordingly, plaintiffs' proposal should be adopted.

C. Defendants' Attempt to Bar Plaintiff's Public Counsel from Access to Confidential Information Should Be Rejected

Defendants seek to prohibit plaintiffs' public counsel from possessing confidential material, claiming that any confidential information they possess is subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA")¹ or the California Public Records Act ("CPRA"). Defs.' Proposed Ord., ¶11. Defendants' proposal lacks merit.

Under §6254 of the CPRA, trade secrets are not subject to disclosure. *See California Sch. Employees Ass'n v. Sunnyvale Elementary Sch. Dist.*, 36 Cal. App. 3d. 46 (1973). Because the proposed orders specify that confidential information includes "trade secrets," such confidential information should not be subject to disclosure, even if it were requested from the files of plaintiffs' public counsel.

Because public plaintiffs' counsel are employed by cities as opposed to federal agencies, FOIA does not apply. See 5 U.S.C. §551(1).

Furthermore, any confidential documents obtained from defendants would be for the purpose of use in the instant litigation and would be exempt from disclosure as "records pertaining to pending litigation to which the public agency is a party" Cal. Gov. Code §6254(b); County of Los Angeles v. Superior Court, No. B134958 2000 Cal. App. Lexis 607 (July 31, 2000), at *19. In addition, documents which constitute attorney work product are exempt from disclosure under §6254(k). Fairley v. Superior Court, 66 Cal. App. 4th 1414 (1998). Because any confidential documents sought by plaintiffs for use in this litigation constitute work product, they are not subject to public disclosure.

Because plaintiffs' public counsel are integral to the prosecution of the instant case, they should have the same access to confidential information as defendants' counsel. Defendants' proposal should be rejected.

D. Defendant's Proposal to Bar Temporary Employees of Plaintiffs from Having Access to Confidential Documents Is Unnecessary

Defendants contend that plaintiffs' use of temporary employees to review confidential information will result in disclosure of confidential information. As a result, defendants' propose that access to confidential information be restricted to permanent employees. Defendants' proposal is unnecessary.

Regardless of whether an employee is permanent or temporary, that employee will be bound by the protective order and be required to sign an acknowledgment prohibiting disclosure of any information derived from access to confidential information. Plaintiffs' proposal reasonably allows for the use of temporary employees should staffing issues arise. Because no additional risk of disclosure results from the use of temporary employees, defendants' limitation should be rejected.

E. Defendants' Limitation on the Expert Witnesses to Whom Plaintiffs Can Disclose Confidential Information Is Overly-restrictive and Burdensome

In a transparent attempt to severely limit plaintiffs' ability to develop expert testimony, defendants propose that plaintiffs be prohibited from disclosing confidential information to experts who are presently affiliated with a competitor of the designating party or any consultant, contractor, vendor, parent or affiliate of the competitor. Defs.' Proposed Ord., ¶11(c). Not surprisingly,

defendants offer no limitation on what constitutes a "consultant, contractor, vendor, parent or affiliate."

Defendants' order would prohibit plaintiffs from disclosing confidential information to virtually every person who works in the firearms industry, and thus ensure that plaintiffs are unable to obtain expert testimony from inside the industry. Defendants do not hide their motive to eliminate the pool of potential expert witnesses for plaintiffs, stating that plaintiffs should be allowed to petition the Court for relief from the expert witness restriction only "[i]f plaintiffs demonstrate that they are somehow unable to obtain sufficient expert testimony from outside the firearms manufacturing industry." Defendants' Memorandum Regarding Limited Discovery, Document Depository and Protective Order ("Defs.' Mem.") at 9.

Defendants' purported concern that allowing experts who are presently affiliated with a competitor of the designating party access to confidential documents will result in the disclosure of trade secrets to a competitor is unjustified. Any expert utilized by plaintiffs would be bound by the protective order and be required to sign an acknowledgment prohibiting disclosure of any information derived from access to confidential information.

Furthermore, plaintiffs' order imposes an obligation on plaintiffs to use "reasonable efforts to find Experts who are not competitors of the Producing Party." Plaintiffs' Proposed Ord., ¶11(c). This proposal strikes a balance between defendants' need to limit disclosure of confidential information and plaintiffs' right to seek expert witnesses from within the firearms industry. If defendants contend that plaintiffs are not fulfilling their obligation, defendants can move the Court for a modification of the protective order. Plaintiffs' Proposed Ord., ¶23.

F. Plaintiffs' Proposal Allowing Counsel of Record in Similar Litigation Throughout the Country Access to Confidential Information Should Be Adopted

Defendants claim that plaintiffs' proposal to allow counsel of record in similar litigation pending in other federal or state courts to have access to confidential information produced in this case will greatly increase the risk of disclosure to the general public. Defs.' Mem. at 11-12. Defendants' claim is illogical.

Irrespective of plaintiffs' proposal, the same number of plaintiffs' counsel throughout the country will be seeking, and ultimately, upon entry of protective orders in the respective jurisdictions, receiving access to confidential information. Allowing all plaintiffs' counsel access to confidential documents in one place does not, as defendants contend, unnecessarily expand the number of persons with access to confidential information or create any additional risk of disclosure.

Furthermore, each counsel seeking access to confidential information will be required to sign an acknowledgment agreeing to be bound by the terms of the protective order and submitting to the Court's jurisdiction for purposes of enforcement of the protective order. As a result, defendants' confidential information will be adequately protected.

G. Defendants' Attempt to Utilize the Protective Order to Bar Admission of Confidential Documents at a Public Trial Should Be Rejected

In order to ensure that defendants cannot seek to bar the admission of relevant confidential documents at trial by claiming that such documents are protected from disclosure under the protective order, plaintiffs propose that the protective order not govern the use of confidential information at trial. Plaintiffs' Proposed Ord., ¶21. Defendants claim that plaintiffs' order will result in confidential documents automatically losing their protection at trial, and propose that issues regarding the protection of confidential information during trial should be presented to the Court as each party deems appropriate. Defs.' Mem. at 6.

Defendants' argument ignores the fact that at a public trial, relevant documents which meet the qualifications for admissibility are admissible, whether or not they are designated confidential under a protective order. *Seattle Times v. Rhinehart*, 467 U.S. 20 (1984). Plaintiffs are not, as defendants' proposal implies, required to seek court approval for each and every confidential document that plaintiffs seek to admit into evidence.

Plaintiffs recognize that defendants may want to protect confidential information from public disclosure after trial and, accordingly, propose that the obligations and protections imposed by the protective order continue beyond the conclusion of the action. Plaintiffs' Proposed Ord., ¶2. Defendants' right to seek the protection from disclosure of confidential documents after trial is in no

way hampered by the fact that the protective order will not govern the admission of such documents at trial. Accordingly, plaintiffs' proposal should be adopted.

H. Defendants' Attempt to Limit Disclosure of Confidential Documents to a Deponent Who Is or Has Been Eligible to Have Access to Confidential Information by Virtue of His or Her Employment Is Unjustified

Plaintiffs seek the right to provide access to confidential information to actual or proposed witnesses or deponents who are reasonably believed to have personal knowledge of facts related to confidential information. Plaintiffs' Proposed Ord., ¶11(d). Defendants' claim that only deponents who by virtue of their employment gained access to confidential documents should have access.

No heightened risk of disclosure arises from plaintiffs' proposal. Regardless of how the witness derived the knowledge of confidential information, that witness must agree to be bound by the protective order and sign an acknowledgment forbidding the disclosure of any confidential information. Limiting access to deponents who have or had access to confidential information solely by virtue of their employment does nothing more than restrict plaintiffs' ability to develop their case and does not limit the risk of disclosure. Accordingly, plaintiffs' proposal should be adopted.

I. No Deadline by Which to Contest the Designation of a Document as Confidential Should Be Imposed

Defendants propose that the parties be obligated to have all issues relating to confidential designations submitted to the Court by sixty days prior to the Trial Readiness Conference. Such a deadline is fraught with the potential for abuse.

Despite defendants' representations that they will have timely produced documents so as to allow plaintiffs ample time to contest any confidentiality designations, no discovery deadlines have been set by this Court. Furthermore, under defendants' scheme, defendants could, in near proximity, or after the sixty day time limit, designate a large amount of documents confidential, thereby forcing plaintiffs to scramble to meet the deadline. Under defendants' proposal, because the protective order remains in place throughout trial, presumably, if plaintiffs failed to meet the sixty day deadline, the documents would remain confidential, and plaintiffs' only chance at using the documents at trial would be if defendants agreed or the judge ordered the confidentiality designations removed. Absent

a strict deadline by which all documents must be designated confidential, no deadline by which to 2 contest a confidential designation should be imposed. 3 III. **CONCLUSION** For the foregoing reasons, the Court should adopt plaintiffs' proposed protective order. 4 5 DATED: August 21, 2000 LOUISE H. RENNE San Francisco City Attorney 6 OWEN J. CLEMENTS Chief of Special Litigation 7 D. CAMERON BAKER INGRID M. EVANS 8 Deputy City Attorneys 1390 Market Street, 6th Floor 9 San Francisco, CA 94102-5408 Telephone: 415/554-3800 10 JAMES K. HAHN 11 City Attorney CARMEL SELLA 12 Special Asst. City Attorney DON KASS 13 Deputy City Attorney MÂRK FRANCIS BURTON 14 Deputy City Attorney 200 N. Main Street 15 1600 City Hall East Los Angeles, CA 90012 16 Telephone: 213/485-4515 17 LLOYD W. PELLMAN Los Angeles County Counsel 18 LAWRENCE LEE HAFETZ Senior Deputy County Counsel 19 500 West Temple Street, Suite 648 Los Angeles, CA 90012 20 Telephone: 213/974-1876 21 MILBERG WEISS BERSHAD **HYNES & LERACH LLP** 22 WILLIAM S. LERACH FRANK J. JANECEK, JR. 23 MICHAEL J. DOWD 24 STEPHEN P. POLAPINK JONAH H. GOLDSTEIN 25 26 27 H H. GOLDSTEIN 28

1 2	600 West Broadway, Suite 1800 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619/231-1058
3	MILBERG WEISS BERSHAD
4	HYNES & LERACH LLP PATRICK J. COUGHLIN EX KANO S. SAMS II
5	100 Pine Street, Suite 2600 San Francisco, CA 94111
7	Telephone: 415/288-4545
8	LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP RICHARD M. HEIMANN
9	ROBERT J. NELSON BARRY R. HIMMELSTEIN
10 11	PIERCE GORE MICHAEL W. SOBOL 275 Battery Street, 30th Floor
12	San Francisco, CA 94111-9333 Telephone: 415/956-1000
13	SAMUEL L. JACKSON
14	Sacramento City Attorney GLORIA ZARCO Deputy City Attorney
15	980 9th Street, 10th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814
16	Telephone: 916/264-5346
17	MANUEL ALBUQUERQUE Berkeley City Attorney MATTHEW J. OREBIC
18 19	Deputy City Attorney 1947 Center Street, 1st Floor
20	Berkeley, CA 94704
21	THOMAS F. CASEY, III San Mateo County Counsel BRENDA B. CARLSON
22	Deputy County Counsel Office of the County Counsel
23	400 County Center Redwood City, CA 94063
24	Telephone: 650/363-4760
25	RICHARD E. WINNIE Alameda County Counsel KRISTEN J. THORSNESS
26 27	Deputy County Counsel Office of Alameda County Counsel
28	1221 Oak Street, Room 463 Oakland, CA 94612-4296 Telephone: 510/272-6700

1	
2	JAYNE W. WILLIAMS Oakland City Attorney RANDOLPH W. HALL
3	Assistant City Attorney JOYCE M. HICKS
4	R. MANUEL FORTES J. PATRICK TANG
5	Deputy City Attorneys One Frank Ogawa Plaza, 6th Floor
6	Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: 510/238-3601
7	THOMPSON, LAWSON LLP
8	MICHAEL S. LAWSON East Palo Alto City Attorney
9	1600 Broadway, Suite 250 Oakland, CA 94612
10	Telephone: 510/835-1600
11	LEGRAND H. CLEGG II Compton City Attorney
12	CELÎA FRANCISCO Deputy City Attorney
13	P.O. Box 5118
14	205 South Willowbrook Avenue Compton, CA 90200 Telephone: 310/605-5582
15	CHARLES E. DICKERSON III
16	Inglewood City Attorney
17	One Manchester Blvd., Suite 860 Inglewood, CA 90301
	Telephone: 310/412-5372
18 19	MICHAEL JENKINS, ESQ. City Attorney
20	City of West Hollywood 333 South Hope Street, 38th Floor
21	Los Angeles, CA 90071 Telephone: 213/626-8484
22	RICHARDS, WATSON & GERSHON
23	SAYRE WEAVER Deputy City Attorney
24	City of West Hollywood P.O. Box 1059
25	Brea, CA 92822-0901 Telephone: 714/990-0901
26	
27	
28	

1 2	CENTER TO PREVENT HANDGUN VI	OLENCE
3	IONATHANE LOWY	
4	wasnington, DC 20005	
5	RUSHNELL CAPLAN & FIFLDING L	T D
6 7	ALAN M. CAPLAN PHILIP NEUMARK	<i>J</i> I
8	PAUL R. HOEBER 221 Pine Street, Suite 600	
9	San Francisco, CA 94104-2715 Telephone: 415/217-3800	
10	JONATHAN D. MCCUE	
11	600 West Broadway, Suite 930	
12	1 elephone: 619/338-8136	
13 14	& TOLL, P.L.L.C.	
15	JOSEPH M. SELLERS	
16	1100 New York Avenue, N.W. West Tower, Suite 500 Washington, DC 20005-3964	
17	Tolonhono: 202/408 4600	
18	1/19 North Broad Street	
19	1 elepnone: 215/204-8959	
20	Attorneys for The People of the State of C et al.	alifornia,
21 22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	N:\CASES\Guns-JCCP\VXR80700.brf	

EXHIBIT A

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO 10 Coordination Proceeding Special Title (Rule JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION 11 1550(b)) PROCEEDING NO. 4095 12 FIREARM CASE 13 Including actions: 14 People, et al. v. Arcadia Machine & Tool, Inc., San Francisco Superior Court No. 303753 15 People, et al. v. Arcadia Machine & Tool, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court No. BC210894 16 et al. 17 People, et al. v. Arcadia Machine & Tool, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court No. BC214794 et al. 18 19 PLAINTIFFS' PROPOSED PROTECTIVE ORDER 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 EXHIBIT A

The parties hereto, through their undersigned counsel, hereby stipulate and agree to the entry of *the following* order ("Protective Order") pursuant to Cal. Code Civ. Proc. §§2025(1), 2030(e), 2031(f), and 2033(e) and Civ. Code §3426.5 for the protection of trade secrets and other confidential research, development and commercial information that may be produced or otherwise disclosed during the course of this action.

Definitions

- 1. The following definitions apply to this Order:
- (a) The term "document" or "documents" shall include all writings discoverable under California Code of Civil Procedure §2031.
- (b) "Confidential Information" refers to information, documents or other material that the designating party reasonably and in good faith believes constitutes or reflects: (i) a Trade Secret or (ii) information whose confidentiality is otherwise protectable under applicable law.
- (c) "Highly Confidential Information" refers to Confidential Information concerning the following: (a) development of products or technologies; (b) current or prospective marketing plans and methods; (c) current or prospective business planning and financial documents, but only when any of the above types of information are so competitively sensitive that their disclosure is highly likely to cause competitive injury to the Designating Party.
- (d) The term "Trade Secret" means information, including a formula, pattern, compilation, program, device, method, technique, or process, that: (i) derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable by proper means by, other persons who can obtain economic value from its disclosure or use, and (ii) is the subject of efforts that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy.

Purpose

2. This Protective Order shall govern the use and dissemination of all information, documents or materials that are produced by the parties or other persons in the Action and designated as Confidential or Highly Confidential in accordance with the terms of this Protective Order. This Protective Order is not intended to address or govern claims of work product or privilege that may be asserted by any of the parties, except as otherwise provided in this Order.

Designation and Treatment

- 3. Any party to this action or other person who produces or supplies information, documents or other materials in this action (hereinafter the "Designating Party") may designate as "Confidential Information" or "Highly Confidential Information" any information, document or material that meets the definitions in Paragraphs 1(b) or (c) of this Protective Order. The designations "Confidential Information" and "Highly Confidential Information" shall be made by affixing on the document or material containing such information, and upon each page so designated if practicable, words that in substance state, "CONFIDENTIAL SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER," respectively. Any material, document or information for which it is impracticable to affix such a legend may be designated by written notice to that effect with a reasonable description of the material in question.
- 4. At the option of the Designating Party, and to facilitate prompt discovery by allowing inspection or review before formal designation in the manner specified above, all information, material or documents produced in response to a subpoena or discovery request shall be treated as Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information pending inspection and copying. Subject to Paragraph 16 of this Order, copies of information, material, and documents selected for copying and reproduced for the inspecting party will lose their status as Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information unless delivered with the necessary legend.
- 5. All persons having access to Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information shall maintain it in a safe and secure manner to ensure compliance with this Order. Any summary, extract, paraphrase, quotation, restatement, compilation, notes or copy containing Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information, or any electronic image or database containing Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information, shall be subject to the terms of this Order to the same extent as the material or information from which such summary, extract, paraphrase, quotation, restatement, compilation, notes, copy, electronic image, database is derived.
- 6. A Designating Party may in good faith redact non-responsive and/or irrelevant Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information from any document or material.

However, unreducted copies of such documents shall be maintained by the Designating Party. Designated attorneys for a Discovering Party and, if necessary, qualified Experts under Paragraph 11(c) retained by them, may have access to the unreducted versions of the documents at a place of the Designating Party's choosing but only for the purpose of ascertaining the appropriateness of any reductions.

7. This Protective Order shall not be construed to protect from production or to permit the designation of any document that the party has not made reasonable efforts to keep confidential, of any document that has been produced in any other action or proceeding without confidentiality protection, except inadvertently produced documents, of any document that has been lawfully obtained by and from another source (or of any document that has been denied confidential treatment in any other action or proceeding.)¹

Limitations on Use

8. Except to the extent expressly authorized by this Order, Confidential Information and Highly Confidential Information shall not be used or disclosed for any purpose other than the preparation and trial of this case and in any appeal taken from any judgment herein. Nothing designated as Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information shall be used for any commercial, business, marketing, competitive, personal, or other purposes whatsoever.

Limitations on Disclosure

- 9. Except with the prior written consent of the Designating Party, or as expressly authorized by this Order, no person receiving Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information may disclose it to any other person. Nothing in this Order, however, shall be deemed to restrict in any manner the Designating Party's use of its own Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information. Each party may disclose its own Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information without regard to this Order, unless otherwise prohibited from doing so.
- 10. Any person to whom Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information may be disclosed pursuant to this Order, except this Court and its personnel, first shall have an opportunity to read a copy of this Protective Order and shall agree in writing to the non-disclosure

Italicized text represents language on which the parties have not reached agreement.

	(b)	Three (3) attorneys and two (2) staff persons from each firm of record
representing e	ach co-c	defendant, absent further order of the Court upon good cause shown and after
notice and op	portunit	y for hearing, who shall be identified to the Designating Party before or
contemporane	ously w	ith disclosure;

- (c) Counsel for plaintiffs may also disclose Highly Confidential information to any consultant, investigator, or expert (collectively, "Expert") who is assisting plaintiffs in the preparation and/or trial of this action, but only to the extent reasonably necessary to enable such Expert to render such assistance, and provided, however, that counsel for plaintiffs will use reasonable efforts to find Experts who are not competitors of the Producing Party;
- (d) Any deponent who is reasonably believed to be or to have been eligible to have access to the Highly Confidential information by virtue of his or her employment or other affiliation with the Designating Party;
- (e) Court reporters and videographers involved in rendering professional services in the action;
- (f) The Court and its personnel subject to the provisions of paragraph 16 of this Order; and
 - (g) Counsel of record in similar litigation pending in other federal or state courts.
- Information pursuant to this Order thereafter receives a subpoena or order to produce such information in any other action or proceeding before any other court or agency, such party or person shall, if there are fewer than 10 days to comply, within 2 days, if possible, or immediately, if not, or if there are more than 10 days, at least 7 court days prior to the due date of compliance, notify the Designating Party of the pendency of the subpoena, public records request or order in writing. To give the Designating Party an opportunity to obtain such relief, the party or person from whom the information is sought shall not make the disclosure before the actual due date of compliance set forth in the subpoena or order.

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25 26

27

28

Depositions Involving Confidential or Highly Confidential Information

- Portions of a deposition or depositions in their entirety may be designated 14. Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information by counsel for the deponent or the Designating Party, with respect to documents or information that it has produced, by indicating that fact on the record at the deposition or in writing no later than 10 days after the date of the deposition. While it is not intended that this Order shall permit wholesale designation of deposition transcripts as confidential, this Order shall permit temporary designation of an entire transcript as Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information where less than all of the testimony in that transcript would fall into those categories, subject to the following procedure. The court reporter shall include on the cover page a clear indication that the deposition has been so designated. Once designated, any deposition transcript in which Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information is discussed, and any exhibits containing Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information, shall be treated as such. Within 10 court days of receipt of the final, unsigned deposition transcript by counsel for the Designating Party, such counsel shall advise the court reporter of the pages, lines and exhibits (if such exhibits are not otherwise so designated) in which Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information appears. The transcript shall be supplemented to indicate such designation. Failure to particularize a designation in this manner after a temporary designation of the deposition in its entirety shall result in the loss of any designation and shall entitle recipients of the deposition to treat the transcript as non-confidential.
- 15. No one may attend, or review the transcripts of, the portions of any depositions at which Confidential or Highly Confidential information is shown or discussed, other than persons authorized to receive access to Confidential or Highly Confidential Information.

Filing or Use of Confidential or Highly Confidential Information as Evidence

16. Where any Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information or information derived therefrom is included in any court filing, such filing shall be marked "CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER" and shall be placed in a sealed envelope marked with the caption of the case and held under seal, provided, however, that when any such materials are filed with the court in pretrial proceedings, counsel shall also file unsealed

Information or Highly Confidential Information. The redacted versions of any documents shall be served on all counsel of record within 10 days after the date that the sealed documents are filed in Court. The unsealed redacted documents shall not be filed with the Court until 15 calendar days following the service on counsel of record.

Objections to Designations

- 17. Any party may, after production of material designated under this Protective Order, object to its designation by notifying the Designating Party in writing of that objection and specifying the designated material to which the objection is made. The parties shall confer within 15 days of service of any written objection. If the objection is not resolved, the Designating Party shall, within 15 days of the conference, file and serve a motion to resolve the dispute and shall bear the burden of proof on the issue. In doing so, the Designating Party shall follow the procedures of paragraph 16 of this Order, if applicable. If no such motion is filed within the stated time period, the material shall cease to be treated as confidential or highly confidential information. If a motion is filed, information subject to dispute shall be treated consistently with its designation until further order of the Court. With respect to any material which is redesignated or ceases to be subject to the protection of this Protective Order, the Designating Party shall, at its expense, provide to each party which so requests additional copies thereof from which all confidentiality legends affixed hereunder have been adjusted to reflect the redesignation or removed as appropriate.
- 18. No party receiving any material designated as Confidential or Highly Confidential or any information derived from Confidential or Highly Confidential material, however, shall disclose any such material or information to any person other than as allowed by this Order without first requesting permission to do so from the Designating Party. The request shall be submitted in writing to the Designating Party not less than 15 court days before any intended disclosure. The request shall specify by Bates number (or other identifying information, if Bates numbers are inapplicable, such as with interrogatory answers) the material or information sought for disclosure, shall state the reason for the disclosure, shall specify the expected circumstances in which the disclosure would be made, and shall state the names and roles of the persons to whom the disclosure

15

16

11

17 18

19

20 21

23

22

24 25

26

27

28

would be made. The party requesting permission must make such requests based on its counsel's good faith judgment that disclosure is reasonably necessary to that party's prosecution or defense of the Action. If the Designating Party objects to the proposed disclosure, the Designating Party shall file a motion to bar the disclosure. The requested disclosure shall not be made during the pendency of the motion.

Inadvertent Waiver

- 19. Inadvertent failure to designate any information pursuant to this Protective Order shall not constitute a waiver of any otherwise valid claim for protection, so long as such claim is asserted within 15 days of the discovery of the inadvertent failure. At such time, arrangements shall be made for the Designating Party to substitute properly labeled copies. However, until the receiving party is notified that the information is designated as Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information, the receiving parties shall be entitled to treat the material as non-confidential.
- In the interest of expediting discovery in these proceedings and avoiding unnecessary 20. costs: (1) inadvertent disclosure in this litigation of privileged information and/or work product shall not constitute a waiver of any otherwise valid claim of privilege, immunity, or other protection; and (2) failure to assert a privilege and/or work product in this litigation as to one document or communication shall not be deemed to constitute a waiver of the privilege, immunity, or protection as to any other document or communication allegedly so protected, even involving the same subject matter. In the case of inadvertently produced privileged and/or work product documents, upon request of the Producing Party, the documents together with all copies thereof and any notes made therefrom shall be returned forthwith to the party claiming privilege and/or work product immunity. Any party may, within 5 court days after notification of inadvertent disclosure under this Paragraph, object to the claim of inadvertence by notifying the Designating/Producing Party in writing of that objection and specifying the designated/produced material to which the objection is made. The parties shall confer within 15 days of service of any written objection. If the objection is not resolved, the Designating Party shall, within 15 days of the conference, file and serve a motion to resolve the dispute and shall bear the burden of proof on the issue. If a motion is filed, information

subject to dispute shall be treated consistently with the Designating/Producing Party's most recent designation until further order of the Court.

Non-Termination

- 21. This Protective Order is not intended to govern the use of Confidential or Highly Confidential information at any trial of this action. Issues regarding the protection of Confidential or Highly Confidential information during trial may be presented to the Court as each party deems appropriate.
- 22. The obligations and protections imposed by this Order shall continue beyond the conclusion of this action, including any appeals, or until the Court orders otherwise. Any information or documents designated as Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information shall continue to be treated as such until such time as (a) the Designating Party expressly agrees in writing that the information, documents, testimony or other materials in question are no longer Confidential or Highly Confidential or (b) there is a finding by the court that the information or documents are not the proper subject of protection under this Order. Within 60 days after receipt of a request from the Designating Party, made after this action has concluded and the time for possible appeal has been resolved, Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information (other than exhibits at the official court of record) shall be returned to the appropriate Designating Party or, at the sole option of the Designating Party, shall be destroyed. Counsel for any party or third party receiving Confidential Information or Highly Confidential Information in this action shall make written certification of compliance with this provision and shall deliver the same to counsel for each Designating Party within 180 days after such request.

Continuing Jurisdiction

23. Any party may petition the Court for a modification of the terms of this Protective Order for good cause shown, after notice and opportunity for a hearing. This Court shall have continuing jurisdiction to modify, amend, enforce, interpret or rescind this Protective Order notwithstanding the termination of this action.

2 3 4 5 6 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO 10 Coordination Proceeding Special Title (Rule JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION 11 1550(b)PROCEEDING NO. 4095 12 FIREARM CASE 13 Including actions: People, et al. v. Arcadia Machine & Tool, Inc., 14 San Francisco Superior Court No. 303753 et al. 15 People, et al. v. Arcadia Machine & Tool, Inc., Los Angeles Superior Court No. BC210894 16 et al. People, et al. v. Arcadia Machine & Tool, Inc., 17 Los Angeles Superior Court No. BC214794 18 19 EXHIBIT A TO PLAINTIFFS' PROPOSED PROTECTIVE ORDER 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT

The undersigned hereby acknowledges and agrees:

- 1. I am aware that a Stipulation and Protective Order (the "Order") has been entered in the above-captioned action. I have had the opportunity to read the Order and understand that willful disclosure of Confidential or Highly Confidential Information may constitute contempt of court, and agree to submit to this Court's jurisdiction for purposes of enforcement of the Order.
- 2. I will not disclose or discuss any Confidential Information or Highly Confidential information with any person except those persons specifically listed in the Order under the procedures therein specified.

Name:		
Address:	. •	
Telephone No.:		
Dated:		

N:\CASES\Guns-JCCP\VXR80702.ExA

_ 1

DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY MAIL

I, the undersigned, declare:

- 1. That declarant is and was, at all times herein mentioned, a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County of San Diego, over the age of 18 years, and not a party to or interest in the within action; that declarant's business address is 600 West Broadway, Suite 1800, San Diego, California 92101.
- 2. That on August 22, 2000, declarant served the **PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' PROPOSED PROTECTIVE ORDER** by depositing a true copy thereof in a United States mailbox at San Diego, California in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid and addressed to the parties listed on the attached Service List.
- 3. That there is a regular communication by mail between the place of mailing and the places so addressed.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 22nd day of August, 2000, at San Diego, California.

LANGULA RWETTA VERONICA RIVERA GUNS JCCP Service List - 08/21/00 Page 1

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S)

Alan M. Caplan
Philip Neumark
Paul R. Hoeber
BUSHNELL, CAPLAN & FIELDING,
LLP
221 Pine Street, Suite 600
San Francisco, CA 94104-2715
415/217-3800
415/217-3820 (fax)

Patrick J. Coughlin
Ex Kano S. Sams II
MILBERG WEISS BERSHAD HYNES &
LERACH LLP
100 Pine Street, Suite 2600
San Francisco, CA 94111
415/288-4545
415/288-4534 (fax)

Jonathan Selbin
Paulina do Amaral
LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN &
BERNSTEIN, LLP
780 Third Avenue, 48th Floor
New York, NY 10017-2024
212/355-9500
212/355-9592 (fax)

James K. Hahn
Carmel Sella
Don Kass
CITY ATTORNEYS OFFICE
200 N. Main Street
1600 City Hall East
Los Angeles, CA 90012
213/485-4515
213/847-3014 (fax)

Legrand H. Clegg II
Celia Francisco
CITY ATTORNEYS OFFICE
205 South WIllowbrook Avenue
Compton, CA 90220
310/605-5582
310/763-0895 (fax)

Jonathan D. McCue Charles McCue MCCUE & MCCUE 600 West Broadway, Suite 930 San Diego, CA 92101 619/338-8136 619/338-0322 (fax)

Steven J. Toll
COHEN, MILSTEIN, HAUSFELD &
TOLL, P.L.L.C.
999 Third Avenue, Suite 3600
Seattle, WA 98104
206/521-0080
206/521-0166 (fax)

Louise H. Renne
D. Cameron Baker
Owen J. Clements
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO
Fox Plaza, 6th Floor
1390 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94102-5408
415/554-3932
415/554-3837 (fax)

Dennis S. Henigan
Jonathan E. Lowy
Brian J. Siebel
CENTER TO PREVENT HANDGUN
VIOLENCE (LEGAL ACTION PROJECT)
1250 Eye St., N.W., Suite 802
Washington, DC 20005
202/289-7319
202/408-9748 (fax)

Charles E. Dickerson III
CITY ATTORNEYS OFFICE
One Manchester Blvd., Suite 860
Inglewood, CA 90301
310/412-5372
310/412-8865 (fax)

GÜNS - JCCP Service List - 08/21/00 Page 2

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S)

Michael Jenkins CITY ATTORNEYS OFFICE (WEST HOLLYWOOD) 333 South Hope Street 38th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 213/626-8484 213/626-0078 (fax)

David Kairys
LAW OFFICE OF DAVID KAIRYS
1719 North Broad Street
Philadelphia, PA 19122
215/204-8959
215/248-6282 (fax)

Manuela Albuquerque
Matthew J. Orebic
CITY ATTORNEYS OFFICE
1947 Center Street, 1st Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704
510/644-6380
510/644-8641 (fax)

Richard E. Winnie Kristen J. Thorsness OFFICE OF ALAMEDA COUNTY COUNSEL 1221 Oak Street, Room 463 Oakland, CA 94612-4296 510/272-6700 510/272-5020 (fax)

Michael S. Lawson
East Palo Alto City Attorney
THOMPSON, LAWSON LLP
1600 Broadway, Suite 250
Oakland, CA 94612
510/835-1600
510/835-2077 (fax)

Sayre Weaver RICHARDS, WATSON & GERSHON P.O. Box 1059 Brea, CA 92822-1059 714/990-0901 714/990-6230 (fax)

Samuel L. Jackson Shana Faber CITY ATTORNEYS OFFICE 980 9th Street, 10th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814 916/264-5346 916/264-7455 (fax)

Thomas F. Casey III
Brenda B. Carlson
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL
400 County Center
Redwood City, CA 94063
650/363-4760
650/363-4034 (fax)

Jayne W. Williams
Randolph W. Hall
Joyce M. Hicks
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEYS
One Frank Ogawa Plaza, 6th Floor
Oakland, CA 94612
510/238-3601
510/238-6500 (fax)

Lloyd W. Pellman
Lawrence Lee Hafetz
Judy Whitehurst
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COUNSEL
500 West Temple Street
Suite 648
Los Angeles, CA 90012
213/974-1876
213/626-2105 (fax)

GUNS - JCCP Service List - 08/21/00 Page 3

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S)

Terry F. Moritz
Roger Lewis
GOLDBERG, KOHN, BELL, BLACK,
ROSENBLOOM & MORITZ, LTD.
55 East Monroe Street
Suite 3700
Chicago, IL 60603-5802
312/201-4000
312/332-2196 (fax)

Richard S. Lewis
Joseph M. Sellers
COHEN, MILSTEIN, HAUSFELD &
TOLL, P.L.L.C.
1100 New York Ave., N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005-3964
202/408-4600
202/408-4699 (fax)

Richard M. Heimann
Robert J. Nelson
LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN &
BERNSTEIN, LLP
275 Battery Street, 30th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
415/956-1000
415/956-1008 (fax)

Frank J. Janecek, Jr.
Michael J. Dowd
Stephen P. Polapink
MILBERG WEISS BERSHAD HYNES &
LERACH LLP
600 West Broadway, Suite 1800
San Diego, CA 92101-5050
619/231-1058
619/231-7423 (fax)

Michael P. Verna
Mary P. Sullivan
BOWLES & VERNA
2121 N. California Blvd.
Suite 875
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
925/935-3300
925/935-0371 (fax)

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS

Jeff Nelson
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON, L.L.P.
1200 Main Street, 27th Floor
Kansas City, MO 64105-2118
816/474-6550
816/421-5547 (fax)

* Diane T. Gorczyca SEDGWICK, DETERT, MORAN & ARNOLD One Embarcadero Center 16th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-3765 415/781-7900 415/781-2635 (fax) GUNS - JCCP Service List - 08/21/00 Page 4

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS

Douglas Kliever
CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN &
HAMILTON
2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
9th Floor
Washington, DC 20036
202/974-1500
202/974-1999 (fax)

Michael John Bonesteel
Steven L. Hoch
Carolyn Trokey
HAIGHT BROWN & BONESTEEL LLP
1620 - 26th Street
Suite 4000 North
Santa Monica, CA 90404
310/449-6000
310/829-5117 (fax)

James P. Dorr
James B. Vogts
WILDMAN, HARROLD, ALLEN & DIXON
225 West Wacker Drive
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-1229
312/201-2000
312/201-2555 (fax)

Robert C. Gebhardt
Craig A. Livingston
SCHNADER, HARRISON, SEGAL &
LEWIS LLP
601 California St., Suite 1200
San Francisco, CA 94108
415/364-6700
415/364-6785 (fax)

Timothy A. Bumann
BUDD LARNER GROSS ROSENBAUM
GREENBERG & SADE
127 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Suite 715
Atlanta, GA 30303
404/688-3000
404/688-0888 (fax)

Edwin W. Green
Kimberly A. Donlon
ALLEN, MATKINS, LECK, GAMBLE &
MALLORY, LLP
515 South Figueroa Street
7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3398
213/622-5555
213/620-8816 (fax)

William M. Griffin III FRIDAY, ELDREDGE & CLARK 2000 First Commercial Bldg. 400 West Capitol Little Rock, AR 72201 501/376-2011 501/376-2147 (fax)

R. Dewitt Kirwan
Robert N. Tafoya
AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER &
FELD, LLP
2029 Century Park East
Suite 2600
Los Angeles, CA 90067
310/229-1000
310/229-1001 (fax)

Steven A. Silver
LAW OFFICES OF STEVEN A. SILVER
1077 West Morton Avenue, Suite C
Porterville, CA 93257
559/782-1552
559/782-0364 (fax)

Charles L. Coleman
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 4050
San Francisco, CA 94104-4801
415/743-6900
415/743-6910 (fax)

GUNS JCCP Service List - 08/21/00 Page 5

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS

John F. Renzulli RENZULLI & RUTHERFORD, LLP 300 East 42nd Street New York, NY 10017 212/599-5533 212/599-5162 (fax)

E. Gordon Haesloop
BARTLETT MCDONOUGH BASTONE &
MONAGHAN
300 Old Country Road
Mineola, NY 11501
516/877-2900
516/877-0732 (fax)

David R. Gross
BUDD LARNER GROSS ROSENBAUM
GREENBERG & SADE
150 JFK Parkway
Short Hills, NJ 07078
973/379-4800
973/379-7734 (fax)

Timothy G. Atwood LAW OFFICE OF TIMOTHY ATWOOD 273 Canal Street Shelton, CT 06484 203/924-4464 203/924-1359 (fax)

Wendy E. Schultz
Norman J. Watkins
LYNBERG & WATKINS, P.C.
888 S. Figueroa Street
16th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
213/624-8700
213/892-2763 (fax)

Robert M. Anderson
WILSON ELSER MOSKOWITZ EDELMAN
& DICKER, LLP
1055 West 7th Street, Suite 2700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
213/624-3044
213/624-8060 (fax)

James R. Branit BOLERO & CARTON, CHTD. 200 N. La Salle Street Suite 2500 Chicago, IL 60601 312/831-1000

Scott L. Braum
Thomas P. Whelley, II
CHERNESKY, HEYMAN & KRESS,
P.L.L.
1100 Courthouse Plaza S.W.
Suite 1100
Dayton, OH 45401-2849
937/449-2834
937/449-2836 (fax)

Burton C. Jacobson
LAW OFFICE OF BURTON C.
JACOBSON
424 South Beverly Drive
Beverly Hills, CA 90212-4414
310/553-8533
310/286-2819 (fax)

* Ray Koletsky
Susan L. Caldwell
KOLETSKY, MANCINI, FELDMAN &
MORROW
3460 Wilshire Blvd., 8th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90010
213/427-2350
213/427-2366 (fax)

GUNS - JCCP Service List - 08/21/00 Page 6

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS

Lawrence S. Greenwald GORDON FEINBLATT ROTHMAN HOFFBERGER & HOLLANDER, LLC 223 East Redwood Street Baltimore, MD 21202 410/576-4000 410/576-4246 (fax)

Henry N. Jannol
LAW OFFICES OF HENRY N. JANNOL
1875 Century Park East
Suite 1400
Los Angeles, CA 90067
310/552-7500
310/552-7552 (fax)

Carmen Trutanich
Timothy Lignoul
TRUTANICH - MICHEL, LLP
Port of Los Angeles
407 N. Harbor Blvd.
San Pedro, CA 90731
310/548-3816
310/548-4813 (fax)

Robert L. Joyce
WILSON ELSER MOSKOWITZ EDELMAN
& DICKER, LLP
150 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 19917
212/490-3000
212/490-3038 (fax)

Bradley T. Beckman
BECKMAN & ASSOCIATES
1601 Market Street, Suite 2330
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215/569-3096
215/569-8769 (fax)

Timothy Gorry
Frank Sandelmann
GORRY & MEYER
2029 Century Park East
Suite 400
Los Angeles, CA 90067
310/277-5967
310/277-5968 (fax)

James Leonard Crew
Jack Leavitt
LAW OFFICES
18 Crow Canyon Court, Suite 380
San Ramon, CA 94583-1669
925/831-0834
925/831-8483 (fax)

Paul K. Schrieffer
Ian R. Feldman
SCHRIEFFER NAKASHIMA & DOWNEY,
LLP
100 N. Barranca Avenue
Suite 1100
West Covina, CA 91791
626/858-2444
626/974-8403 (fax)

Michael J. Zomick
TARICS & CARRINGTON, P.C.
5005 Riverway Drive, Suite 500
Houston, TX 77056
713/729-4777
713/227-0701 (fax)

GUNS JCCP Service List - 08/21/00 Page 7

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS

Jeff G. Harmeyer MCATEE HARMEYER LLP 401 West "A" Street, Suite 1850 San Diego, CA 92101 619/231-9800 619/234-3800 (fax)

Phillip Hudson III
GUNSTER, YOAKLEY, VALDEZ-FAULI
& STEWART
One Biscayne Tower, Suite 3400
2 South Biscayne Blvd.
Miami, FL 33131
305/376-6000
305/376-6010 (fax)

Robert Wright
WRIGHT & L'ESTRANGE
701 B Street, Suite 1550
San Diego, CA 92101-8103
619/231-4844
619/231-6710 (fax)

*DENOTES SERVICE VIA FACSIMILE

Michael C. Hewitt BRUINSMA & HEWITT 380 Clinton Avenue, Unit C Costa Mesa, CA 92626 714/955-0194

* Christopher J. Healey
Lawrence J. Kouns
LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON &
SCRIPPS
600 West Broadway, Suite 2600
San Diego, CA 92101-3391
619/236-1414
619/232-8311 (fax)