## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY	)	
COMMISSION,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	1:06-cv-1083-SEB-JMS
	)	
EBY-BROWN COMPANY, LLC,	)	
Defendant.	)	

## **ORDER**

Having considered the motions, responses, and replies filed by the parties, the Court hereby **GRANTS** Defendants Eby-Brown, Company, LLC's, Kevin Jones', Jeffrey Murphy's, and David Alexander's Motion to Compel Discovery, and **DENIES** the request for sanctions. The Court finds that the prior Stipulated Protective Order (Docket Entry 55) agreed to by all parties not only permitted, but required the disclosure of the information sought by Defendants. The Court will not entertain objections to the propriety of the disclosures given the parties' agreement and request for Court approval. Moreover, the Court finds the information is properly discoverable and potentially relevant to Defendant's defense that it had a legitimate non-discriminatory and non-retaliatory reason to terminate Plaintiff-Intervenor.

Accordingly, Plaintiff Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and Plaintiff-Intervenor Ahmed Conde are ordered to produce his current user names and passwords to his internet based e-mail accounts (including any accounts he had within the 60 days prior to his termination) to 24 Seven Discovere, LLC within three (3) business days of the date of the entry of this Order. Plaintiff-Intervenor is further ordered not to change any user names or password on his e-mail accounts until he is notified that 24 Seven Discovere, LLC has

completed its review of Plaintiff-Intervenor's e-mail files. 24 Seven Discovere, LLC shall have

3 business days from receipt of the e-mail user names and passwords to conduct its search of

Plaintiff-Intervenor's e-mail accounts.

Further Plaintiff-Intervenor is to make his initial disclosures to Defendants pursuant to

Rule 26(a)(l) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure within five (5) business days of the date of

the entry of this Order.

While the Court disagrees with the response to the discovery requests provided by both

Conde and EEOC, the Court finds that ambiguity in the protective order and a potential

misunderstanding as to the work being performed by 24 Seven Discovere, LLC at Plainitt-

Intervenor's counsel's office may have given rise to the dispute in question. The Court therefore

declines to impose sanctions.

In the future the parties are encouraged to arrange a telephone status conference with the

magistrate judge (following their Local Rule 37.1 conference if unsuccessful) prior to filing any

disputed discovery motions.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

06/04/2007

Jane Magnus-Stinson

United States Magistrate Judge

Southern District of Indiana

## Copies to:

Eugene A. Boyle NEAL GERBER & EISENBERG LLP eboyle@ngelaw.com

Swaray Edward Conteh contehlaw@att.net

Kelley Bertoux Creveling BAKER & DANIELS kbcrevel@bakerd.com

Michelle Eisele EEOC michelle.eisele@eeoc.gov

Jo Ann Farnsworth EEOC joann.farnsworth@eeoc.gov

Gerald A. Golden NEAL GERBER EISENBERG LLP ggolden@ngelaw.com

Laurie A. Young
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION
legal.station@eeoc.gov