



Feb 16 2011
12:13PM

DISTRICT COURT, DENVER COUNTY, COLORADO Denver City and County Building 1437 Bannock St. Denver, Colorado 80202	▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲
Plaintiffs: ANTHONY LOBATO, et al. and Plaintiff-Intervenors: ARMANDINA ORTEGA, et al. v. Defendants: THE STATE OF COLORADO, et al.	
<i>Attorneys for Plaintiffs Creede Consol. School District No. 1, Del Norte Consol. School District No. C-7, Moffat School District No. 2, and Mountain Valley School District No. RE 1</i> Kyle C. Velte, #31093 Ryann B. MacDonald, #41231 REILLY POZNER LLP 511 Sixteenth Street, Suite 700 Denver, CO 80202 Telephone:(303) 893-6100 Facsimile: (303) 893-6110 Email: kvelte@rplaw.com rmacdonald@rplaw.com	Case No. 2005CV4794 Div. 9
<p align="center">PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' FIRST DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICT PLAINTIFF CREEDE CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1</p>	

Pursuant to C.R.C.P. 34, Plaintiffs, Anthony Lobato, et al., ("Plaintiffs"), through counsel, hereby respond on behalf of Plaintiff Creede Consolidated School District No. 1 (the "District") to Defendants' First Request For Production Of Documents to School District Plaintiffs served October 12, 2010 ("Request for Production"):

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Best Knowledge, Information and Belief. This Response to the Discovery is made to the best of Plaintiffs' present knowledge, information and belief. This Response is at all times subject to such additional or different information that discovery or further investigation

may disclose and is subject to additional knowledge of facts, as may result from its further discovery or investigation. Plaintiffs reserve the right to supplement this Response in accordance with C.R.C.P. 26(e).

2. Subsequent Discovery of Documents or Information. Plaintiffs reserve the right to make any use of, or to introduce at any hearing and/or at trial, documents or other information responsive to the Discovery Request but discovered by Plaintiffs subsequent to the date of this Response to Discovery.

3. Attorney-Client Privilege and Work Product Doctrine. Plaintiffs object to the Discovery Request to the extent that it requests information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, or any other applicable legal privilege against disclosure. Such privileged documents and information shall not be produced in response to the Discovery Request, and any inadvertent production thereof shall not be deemed a waiver of any privilege with respect to such documents or information.

4. Preservation of Objections. Plaintiffs reserve all objections as to the competency, relevance, materiality, privilege and/or admissibility as evidence in any subsequent proceeding and/or trial of this or any other action for any purpose whatsoever of any documents, information or things produced in this Response to the Discovery.

5. Definitions. Plaintiffs object to all definitions, instructions, interrogatories, and document requests in the Discovery Request in which the phrases “describe,” “relate to” or “relating to,” “every” and “all” appear. The terms “describe,” “relate to,” “relating to,” “every” and “all” are overly broad, vague, ambiguous and unintelligible, require subjective judgment on the part of Plaintiffs and their attorneys.

6. Expansive Definitions and Instructions. Plaintiffs object to all definitions and instructions to the Discovery Request to the extent that such definitions and instructions purport to enlarge, expand, or alter in any way the plain meaning and scope of any specific term, phrase or request on the grounds that such enlargement, expansion, or alteration renders such term, phrase or request vague, ambiguous, unintelligible, overbroad and uncertain. Plaintiffs also object to all definitions that purport to expand or enlarge Plaintiffs’ obligations under the Colorado Rules of Civil Procedure.

7. Time Period. Plaintiffs object to the Discovery Request to the extent that it requests information generated prior to 2005. Given the broad scope of the Discovery Requests and the nature and evolution of education reform and education finance, any potential relevance of that information is substantially outweighed by the burden to collect, review, analyze, and produce that information in a responsive format. The requests for information generated prior to 2005 are therefore unduly burdensome, and such information will not be produced.

8. Confidentiality. This Response to the Discovery is made subject to the Confidentiality Order entered in this action. Any confidential information produced without

being marked “Confidential” is unintentional and inadvertent, and Plaintiffs reserve the right to require that such information be marked and treated confidential or returned to Plaintiffs.

9. Burden. Plaintiffs object to the Discovery Requests to the extent they request information already in the possession of Defendants. Much of this information has been previously submitted to Defendants by Plaintiffs. It would be unduly burdensome, oppressive, and unreasonably duplicative to again provide such information to Defendants. Further, Plaintiffs object to the Discovery Requests to the extent the burden of deriving or ascertaining responses to the requests is substantially the same or less for Defendants than for Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs also object to the Discovery Requests to the extent they seek information obtainable from some other source that is more convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive.

10. Possession, Custody, or Control. Plaintiffs object to producing documents that are not within its possession, custody, or control.

11. Scope of Responsive Documents. The scope of documents that fall within the ambit of Plaintiffs’ obligations under C.R.C.P. 26(a)(1)(B) and the Discovery Request does not include e-mails stored on e-mail servers. Specifically, e-mails stored on e-mail servers are not relevant to disputed facts alleged with particularity in the pleadings and are not responsive to the Discovery Request. And, to the extent such e-mails are arguably relevant, the burden and expense of collecting, reviewing, and producing such documents substantially outweighs any likely benefit of producing these documents in light of the needs of Defendants, the parties’ resources, and the importance of the e-mails to this lawsuit. Where e-mails have been produced, such e-mails were stored on non-e-mail servers that stored responsive documents, and those produced e-mails had a particular relevance not shared by e-mails simply stored on e-mail servers. Moreover, Defendants have not produced e-mails stored on e-mail servers pursuant to Rule 26(a)(1) or Plaintiff’s Request for Production. Accordingly, e-mails stored on e-mail servers will not be produced.

12. Specific Objections. In addition to these General Objections, Plaintiffs may set forth other and further objections with its specific responses. By its specific objection, Plaintiffs do not intend to limit or restrict these General Objections.

13. Incorporation. Plaintiffs incorporate all of the foregoing General Objections into each Response to the Discovery Requests below.

DOCUMENTS REQUESTED

17. All documents concerning presentations given by District leaders, including but not limited to school board members, the District’s Superintendent, the District’s Chief Financial Officer, or the District’s business manager, regarding District budget and finances.

Response to Request No. 17: In addition to the General Objections, Plaintiffs object to this Request for Production on the basis that it is vague, overbroad, and burdensome.

Subject to and without waiving the General Objections, the District states that the District does not maintain an archive of the requested materials.

26. All District documents relating to truancy, including but not limited to the costs associated with truancy and any efforts to diminish truancy, from 2000 to the present.

Response to Request No. 26: In addition to the General Objections, Plaintiffs object to this Request for Production on the basis that it is vague, overbroad, and burdensome. Subject to and without waiving the General Objections, the District states that responsive documents in the possession, custody, or control of the District have been produced. See CREEDE004173 – 4199.

Dated: February 16, 2011

REILLY POZNER LLP

/s/ Kyle Velte

Kyle C. Velte, #31093

Ryann B. MacDonald, #41234

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Creede Consol. School
District No. 1, Del Norte Consol. School
District No. C-7, Moffat School District No. 2,
and Mountain Valley School District No. RE 1*

The original, executed document is on file at the offices of Reilly Pozner LLP.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on the 16th day of February, 2011, a true and correct copy of the foregoing **PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' FIRST DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICT PLAINTIFF CREEDE CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1** was served via LexisNexis[®] File & Serve, addressed to the following:

David G. Hinojosa
Nina Perales
Diego Bernal
MALDEF
110 Broadway, Suite 300
San Antonio, TX 78205

John W. Suthers, Attorney General
Antony B. Dyl
Carey Taylor Markel
Ann H. Cisneros
Erica Weston
Jonathan Fero
Nicholas P. Heinke
1525 Sherman Street, 7th Floor
Denver, CO 80203
Office of the Attorney General

Kathleen J. Gebhardt
Kathleen J. Gebhardt LLC
1426 Pearl Street, Ste. 201
Boulder, CO 80302
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Anthony Lobato,
Denise Lobato, Taylor Lobato and Alexa
Lobato, Colorado Springs School District
11, Monte Visa School District No. C-8,
Alamosa School District No. RE-11J*

Alexander Halpern
Jennifer Bezoza
Alexander Halpern LLC
1426 Pearl Street, Ste. 201
Boulder, CO 80302
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Anthony Lobato,
Denise Lobato, Taylor Lobato and Alexa
Lobato, Colorado Springs School District
11, Monte Visa School District No. C-8,
Alamosa School District No. RE-11J*

Henry Solano
Dewey & Le Boeuf
4121 Bryant St.
Denver, CO 80211

Kenzo Kawanabe
Daniel P. Spivey
Terry R. Miller
Rebecca J. Dunaway
Geoffrey C. Klingsporn
Davis Graham & Stubbs LLP
1550 17th Street, Ste. 500
Denver, CO 80202
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Anthony Lobato,
Denise Lobato, Taylor Lobato and Alexa
Lobato, Colorado Springs School District
11, Jefferson County School District No. R-
1, Monte Vista School District No. C-8,
Alamosa School District No. RE-11J*

Jess A. Dance
Perkins Coie LLP
1899 Wynkoop St., Ste. 700
Denver, CO 80202
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Sanford School
District 6J, North Conejos School District
RE-1J, South Conejos School District RE-
10, and Centennial School District No. R-
1*

David W. Stark
Joseph C. Daniels
Sera Chong
Faegre & Benson LLP
1700 Lincoln Street, Ste. 3200
Denver, CO 80203
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Jessica Spangler,
Herbert Conboy, Victoria Conboy, Terry
Hart, Kathy Howe-Kerr, Larry Howe-Kerr,
John T. Lane, Jennifer Pate, Blanche J.
Podio and Robert L. Podio*

Kimberley D. Neilio
Greenberg Traurig LLP
1200 Seventeenth Street, Ste. 2400
Denver, CO 80202
*Attorney for Plaintiff Pueblo, School
District No. 60 in the County of Pueblo
and State of Colorado*

Alyssa K. Yatsko
Holland & Hart LLP
555 17th Street, Ste. 3200
P.O. Box 8749
Denver, CO 80201
*Attorney for Plaintiff Jefferson County
School District No. R-1*

/s/ Kyle Velte

The original, executed document is on file at the offices of Reilly Pozner LLP.