IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF PHILADELPHIA COUNTY FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA CIVIL TRIAL DIVISION COMPLEXITOR

COMPLEX LIT CENTER
MAY 1 2 2010

ROBERT DUBOSE, Administrator for the Estate of ELISE DUBOSE, Deceased,

Plaintiff,

V.

WILLOWCREST NURSING HOME; ALBERT EINSTEIN HEALTHCARE NETWORK,

Defendants.

J. STEWART

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS PHILADELPHIA COUNTY

AUGUST TERM, 2009 No. 1603

Dubose Vs Willowcrest Nursing Home Etal-ORDER



ORDER

AND NOW, this 10 day of May, 2010, up

consideration of plaintiff's motion to determine objections and gain more specific answers to defendants' Willowcrest Nursing Home ("Willowcrest") and Albert Einstein Healthcare Network ("Albert Einstein") answers to plaintiff's interrogatories and request for production of documents, it is hereby ORDERED that the motion is granted in part and denied in part as follows as to Albert Einstein:

- 1. Plaintiff's motion to compel a response to interrogatory number 1 is denied as moot. All parties are cautioned that they must confer with one another and attempt in good faith to resolve discovery disputes before filing discovery motions.
- 2. Plaintiff's motion to compel a response to interrogatory number 10 is denied as to Albert Einstein because it is

overbroad as worded, and based on defendant's representation that this information as to CNAs is in the possession and control of Willowcrest.

- held for further consideration of the documents listed on the Combined Privilege and Irrelevancy Log. By May 14, 2010, Albert Einstein shall group the documents by privilege asserted and basis for objection, and identify sample documents to submit for an <u>in camera</u> inspection. By May 14, 2010 Albert Einstein shall share this revised listing by type of objection or privilege and document with plaintiff's counsel, and the parties shall attempt in good faith to reach agreement on the privilege issues and irrelevancy issues to be presented to the Discovery Master for <u>in camera</u> review and recommendation to the Court.
- 4. Plaintiff's motion as to interrogatory number 20 is denied as written as vague. Plaintiff may narrow the request, or attempt to define in specific ways the term "disgruntled employee."
- 5. Plaintiff's motion to compel production of documents by Albert Einstein is granted in part and denied in part as follows:
- a. By May 7, 2010, Albert Einstein shall produce the following documents requested by numbers 1 through 3: Declaration sheet, definitions, covered entities, and exclusions. Plaintiff shall maintain the confidentiality of these documents, and shall not disclose the information contained in the documents or the documents, except for

the purposes of this litigation and other related litigation in which plaintiff is a party.

b. Request number 4 is denied based on Albert Einstein's fowever a Uspenielle Batty must line a affective representation that it has no such records. It Albert Einstein discovers to that it has such records, they must be produced within ten (10) days of the discovery.

The discovery.

held for further consideration of the documents listed on the Combined personal Privilege and Irrelevancy Log. By May 14, 2010, Albert Einstein shall group the documents by privilege asserted and basis for objection, and identify sample documents to submit for an in camera inspection. By May 14, 2010 defendants shall share this revised listing by type of objection or privilege and document with plaintiff's counsel and the parties shall attempt in good faith to reach agreement on the privilege issues and irrelevancy issues to be presented to the Discovery Master for in camera review and recommendation to the Court.

- d. As to requests number 33 and 36, by May 14, 2010, the plaintiff shall propose three and six specific months of records for consideration by the Court. Upon good cause shown, the plaintiff may obtain additional records.
 - e. Request number 35 is withdrawn.
- f. The motion is granted as to number 38, and Albert Einstein shall produce the requested documents by May 21, 2010.