

CA - Edison

20-Aug-75

Letter-re: arguing that the
P's supplemental interrogatories
~~are~~ ~~permissible~~ ask permissible
questions.

pgs = 2

CA001338L

August 20, 1975

Mr. Roland Winter, Esq.
940 Araboy Avenue
Edison, Hew Jersey 08817

Res Urban League of Greater New Brunswick,
et al vs. the Mayor and Council of the
Borough of Carteret; et al.

Dear Mr. Winter:

This is in reply to your letter of August 13 regarding plaintiffs¹ Supplemental Interrogatories. At the first conference with Judge Furman he suggested that the Request for Admissions procedure be used to secure information about defendants' zoning policies, land use practices and reasons for their use. At the second conference on June 20, plaintiffs' counsel noted that some defendants were not responding fully to certain requests for admissions. Judge Furman then suggested that interrogatories be used to solicit this information. I noted in my cover letter to the Supplemental Interrogatories that they were in part designed to substitute for question number 11 of the Request for Admissions. We therefore do not feel that such interrogatories are in derogation of the attorneys' agreement; on the contrary, they are consistent with the discussion at the last conference. I hope this clears up any misunderstanding on this point.

Secondly, plaintiffs do not believe that any of the interrogatories request the production of privileged information, such as attorney work product. Rule 4:1.0-2 (d) clearly provides for discovery of names, addresses, and the substance of facts and opinions of experts who are expected to testify (see R-4:10-2(d)(1)). This is the intent of the Supplemental Interrogatories concerning experts.

Mr* Roland Winter
August 20, It75
Page - 2 -

Finally, to the extent you consider certain specific interrogatories objectionable, **H-4:17-5** provides that the party **must** state with particularity **the** grounds for objection or **within**. 20 days after service of **the** interrogatories move to strike any question, **iff**tile I appreciate your frankness, blanket general objections are not allowed under **the** rules.

I **hope** this letter is rasponsiir© to your inquiries. If, after evaluatia<i it, you still wisli to adlnere to ^our stated position, I would appreciate your advising me*

If I do not hear from you **by** August 29 that you intend to respond to the SttppleuMital Interrogatories, X believe it would be appropriate to *move* to compel answers to tlieia.

Sincerely,

Oaniel A. Searing
Attorney for Plaintiffs

DAS*bit