Joshua Ro Michel & A 180 E. Oce	obress of attorney or party without attorney: obert Dale Associates, PC ean Blvd., Suite 200 ch, CA 90802	STATE BAR NUMBER 209942	Reserved for Clerk's File Stamp	
ATTO	DDRESS (Optional); Jdale@michellawyers.com RNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff, Michele Hanisee	otional): 562-216-4445	FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:			04/25/2024 David W. Slayton, Executive Officer / Clerk of Co	
111 N. Hill St., Los Angeles, CA 90012			By: C. Crow Deputy	
PLAINTIFF: Michele Hanisee  DEFENDANT:				
State of California				
INFORMAL DISCOVERY CONFERENCE (pursuant to the Discovery Resolution Stipulation of the parties)			CASE NUMBER: 23STCV07718	
1.	1. This document relates to:			
	<ul><li>Request for Informal Discovery Conference</li><li>Answer to Request for Informal Discovery Conference</li></ul>			
2.	Deadline for Court to decide on Request: 05/06/2024 (insert date 10 calendar days following filing of the Request).			
3.	Deadline for Court to hold Informal Discovery Conference: 05/15/2024 (insert date 20 calendar days following filing of the Request).			
4.	4. For a Request for Informal Discovery Conference, <u>briefly</u> describe the nature of the discovery dispute, including the facts and legal arguments at issue. For an Answer to Request for Informal Discovery Conference, <u>briefly</u> describe why the Court should deny the requested discovery, including the facts and legal arguments at issue.			
	conducted the investigation is objected to various requests work-product privilege. Plair protect documents, communicated client nor the firm in the improvides that the privilege of purpose" is investigative and publicly published the investigation.	The law firm representing Defendant here also he investigation into the DOJ data leak. Defendant various requests citing attorney-client privilege and t privilege. Plaintiff asserts these privileges do not uments, communications, notes, or reports made by the the firm in the investigatory context. Case law at the privilege does not extend when the "dominant investigative and not legal-advisement. The firm blished the investigation report, which is strong at the dominant purpose was investigation and not ement.		
	Issue #2 - Defendant refuses to answer basic form interrogatories including 1.1, 15.1., 16.1-16.3, and 12.1-12.3, citing privilege. This denies Plaintiff basic and critical information about Defendant's defenses and stance on causation.			
Issue #3 - Plaintiff specified formatting requirements for production but Defendant produced in other formats that madiscovery review unnecessarily laborious and deny Plaintifaccess to important metadata.			ats that make	

**6** 

## 1 PROOF OF SERVICE 2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 3 I, Christina Castron, am employed in the City of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, 4 California. I am over the age eighteen (18) years and am not a party to the within action. My business address is 180 East Ocean Boulevard, Suite 200, Long Beach, California 90802. 5 On April 25, 2024, I served the foregoing document(s) described as: 6 INFORMAL DISCOVERY CONFERENCE 7 on the interested parties in this action by placing 8 $\Box$ the original ☑ a true and correct copy 9 thereof by the following means, addressed as follows: 10 Laura Lively, Esq. MORRISON FOERSTER 11 707 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 6000 Los Angeles, CA 90017-3543 12 LLively@mofo.com Attorneys for Defendant 13 14 (BY MAIL) As follows: I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under the practice it would be deposited with the 15 U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Long Beach, 16 California, in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date is more than one day after 17 date of deposit for mailing an affidavit. 18 |X|(VIA ELECTRONIC SERVICE) Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons 19 at the electronic notification addresses listed above. 20 $\boxtimes$ (STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that 21 the foregoing is true and correct. 22 (FEDERAL) I declare that I am employed in the office of the member of the bar of this $\Box$ court at whose direction the service was made. 23 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the 24 foregoing is true and correct. 25 26 27 28