

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001

In the Matter of

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, OFFICE)
OF APPRENTICESHIP TRAINING,)
EMPLOYER AND LABOR SERVICES,)
)
Prosecuting Party,)
)
v.)
)
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT)
OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS,)
)
Respondent,)
)
and)
)
CALIFORNIA APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL,)
)
Respondent.)
_____)

Case Nos. 2002-CCP-1,
2003-CCP-1

PARTIES' JOINT DISCOVERY STATUS REPORT

Pursuant to the administrative law judge's September 5, 2003 order in the above case, counsel for all the parties met in San Francisco the week of September 22 and amicably resolved all the issues raised in Prosecuting Party Office of Apprenticeship Training, Employer and Labor Services' ("OATELS") motion to compel. Respondent California Department of Industrial Relations' ("CDIR") informed OATELS that some further documents would be produced or made available for copying in the near future. CDIR also agreed to continue looking for the rule-making file for an earlier version of the regulation that was the subject of one of OATELS'

discovery requests. A stipulation reciting the particulars of the resolution of each of these issues is attached hereto.¹

The parties also discussed CDIR's and CAC's September 15, 2003 responses to OATELS' second set of discovery requests. OATELS is satisfied that CDIR has now sufficiently responded to all of these requests, but OATELS may ask CDIR to stipulate in writing to some of the oral clarifications the state agency provided at the conference.²

Respectfully submitted,

CHARLES D. RAYMOND
Associate Solicitor for
Employment and Training
Legal Services

HARRY L. SHEINFELD
Counsel for Litigation

FRED D. LONSDALE
CAROL BELCHER
Attorney, Office of the Director,
Legal Unit, California Department of
Industrial Relations

STEPHEN R. JONES
Attorney
SCOTT GLABMAN
Senior Appellate Attorney

Dated: _____

Office of the Solicitor
U.S. Department of Labor
Suite N-2101
200 Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20210
Tel.: (202) 693-5710
Fax: (202) 693-5732

Dated: _____

¹ By letter to the ALJ dated September 25, 2003, counsel for Respondent California Apprenticeship Council ("CAC") announced that he would be going on vacation before this status report was due and asked that CDIR's status report also be accepted as CAC's report.

² OATELS believes that a few of CAC's responses to the second round of discovery requests are still insufficient, but this matter is outside the scope of OATELS' motion to compel and the attached stipulation. OATELS will seek clarification of these responses from CAC informally and, if necessary, through supplemental discovery requests.