## United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Nume of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge			John W	'. Darrah	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge			
CASE NUMBER			03 C	6851	DATE	October	12, 2004	
CASE TITLE				EEOC v. Whitehall Hotel, Ltd., et al.				
MO	TION:		[In the following box (a) of the motion being pre	(a) indicate the party filing the motion, e.g., plaintiff, defendant, 3rd party plaintiff, and (b) state briefly the nature resented.]				
DOCKET ENTRY:								
(1)	☐ Fi	Filed motion of [ use listing in "Motion" box above.]						
(2)	□ Bi	ief i	f in support of motion due					
(3)	□ A	Answer brief to motion duc Reply to answer brief due						
(4)	□ Rt	Ruling/Hearing on set for at						
(5)	□ St	Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at						
(6)	□ Pr	Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at						
(7)	☐ Tr	Trial[set for/re-set for] on at						
(8)	□ (B	Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued to at						
(9)		nis case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to] FRCP4(m)  General Rule 21  FRCP41(a)(1)  FRCP41(a)(2).						
(10)	[Other docket entry] Defendants' Motion to Quash is denied. Status hearing scheduled for 10/20/04 is stricken. See reverse side of Minute Order.							
(11) For further detail see order on the reverse side of the original minute order.]								
	No notices required, advised in open court.						Document Number	
	No notices required.  Notices mailed by judge's staff.					number of notices	<u>                                      </u>	
	Notified counsel by telephone.					OCT 1 3 2004	2	
×	Docketing to mail notices.			100		15		
	Mail AO 450 form.			1995 1995 1995 1995 1995 1995 1995 1995		docketing deputy initials		
	Copy to judge/magistrate judge.							
			courtroom deputy's		1 1 400 noon	date mailed notice		
			initials	Date/time	received in			
			100,000	central Cl	erk's Office	mailing deputy initials		

## ORDER

Defendant corporations seek to quash a Rule 30(b)(6) Notice of Deposition in which Plaintiff seeks to have Defendants identify an officer, agent or employee to testify about eleven items regarding, in part, the identity of entities who owned or operated either of the Defendants and the identity and explanation of any and all relationships between and among the Defendants and their parents, subsidiaries and affiliates. Defendants object to all but two of the items, arguing that the information sought is beyond the operations of the Defendants and related to unidentified and unnamed entities. Plaintiff argues that it merely trying to identify the entity that employed the charging party in light of repeated claims by the Defendants that the EEOC was suing the wrong defendant.

"Parties may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the claim.... Relevant information need not be admissible at trial if the discovery appears to be reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence...." Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1).

The information sought by Plaintiff is arguably relevant to the EEOC's claim and appears to be reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Accordingly, Defendants' Motion to Quash is denied.