


1 CCP § 2018.030(b) such as to allow discovery as to any of the
2 interviews that may be found to be not absolutely privileged?

3 3) As to interrogatory 12.3, does the STATE contend
4 that answering said interrogatory would result in opposing
5 counsel taking undue advantage of the attorney for the STATE'S
6 industry of efforts or that answering said interrogatory would
7 reveal the attorney of the STATE'S tactics, impressions or
8 evaluation of the case?

9 Each side shall file and serve its opening memorandum
10 no later than August 23, 2012, opposition shall be filed and
11 served no later than August 30, 2012 and any reply shall be
12 filed and served no later than September 6, 2012.

13
14 Dated: AUG 14 2012


15 WILLIAM A. MAYHEW,
16 Judge of the Superior Court
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

FILED

AUG 14 2012
CLERK OF SUPERIOR COURT
COUNTY OF STANISLAUS

BY
[Handwritten Signature]

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF STANISLAUS

DEBRA COITO, individually and as
Successor in Interest to
Decedent, JEREMY WILSON,

Plaintiff,

Case No.: 624500

NOTICE OF HEARING ON ISSUES
RE REMAND

vs.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA; COUNTY OF
STANISLAUS; CITY OF CERES; CITY
OF MODESTO; TUOLUMNE RIVER
REGIONAL PARK; JOINT POWERS
AUTHORITY; and DOES 1 through
500,

Defendants.

And related cross-actions.

This matter is SET on September 21, 2012 at 8:30 a.m.
in Department 21 by the Court for hearing as to those issues
remanded by our Supreme Court.

1) Does the absolute privilege apply to all or any
part of the recorded witness interviews?

2) Does the Plaintiff contend that they can make a
sufficient showing of unfair prejudice or injustice under

RECEIVED

AUG 17 2012