

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	John W. Darrah	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge	
CASE NUMBER	03 C 6851	DATE	December 8, 2004
CASE TITLE	EEOC v. Whitehall Hotel, Ltd., et al.		

[In the following box (a) indicate the party filing the motion, e.g., plaintiff, defendant, 3rd party plaintiff, and (b) state briefly the nature of the motion being presented.]

MOTION:

DOCKET ENTRY:

- (1) Filed motion of [use listing in "Motion" box above.]
- (2) Brief in support of motion due _____.
- (3) Answer brief to motion due _____. Reply to answer brief due _____.
- (4) Ruling/Hearing on _____ set for _____ at _____.
- (5) Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on _____ set for _____ at _____.
- (6) Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on _____ set for _____ at _____.
- (7) Trial[set for/re-set for] on _____ at _____.
- (8) [Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued to _____ at _____.
- (9) This 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 for a Protective Order is denied. See reverse side of Minute Order.
- (11) [For further detail see order on the reverse side of the original minute order.]

<input type="checkbox"/> No notices required, advised in open court. <input type="checkbox"/> No notices required. <input type="checkbox"/> Notices mailed by judge's staff. <input type="checkbox"/> Notified counsel by telephone. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Docketing to mail notices. <input type="checkbox"/> Mail AO 450 form. <input type="checkbox"/> Copy to judge/magistrate judge.	courtroom deputy's initials Date/time received in central Clerk's Office	number of notices DEC 09 2004 <small>date docketed</small> <small>docketing deputy initials</small> <small>date mailed notice</small> mailing deputy initials	Document Number 51
---	---	--	---

ORDER

Defendants seek a protective order relating to 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 previously filed a Motion to Quash the same Notice of Deposition for which the Defendants now seek a protective order. Defendants' Motion to Quash was denied because the information sought by Plaintiff was arguably relevant to the EEOC's claim and appeared to be reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. In essence, Defendants' present Motion for a Protective Order seeks to limit the deposition addressed in the Motion to Quash, making the same or similar arguments previously rejected by the Court. These arguments have been rejected by the Court.

Based on the above, Defendants' Motion for a Protective Order is denied.