JAMIE CROOK Chief Counsel (#245757)
Jamie.crook@calcivilrights.ca.gov
RUMDUOL VUONG, Assistant Chief Counsel (#264392)
Rumduol.vuong@CalCivilRights.ca.gov
BRETT WATSON, Associate Chief Counsel (#327669)
Brett.watson@calcivilrights.ca.gov
DYLAN COLBERT, Staff Counsel (#341424)
Dylan.colbert@calcivilrights.ca.gov
ELIANA MATA, Staff Counsel (#327845)
Eliana.mata@calcivilrights.ca.gov
CALIFORNIA CIVIL RIGHTS DEPARTMENT
651 Bannon Street, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95811
Telephone: (916) 964-1925
Facsimile: (888) 382-5293

Attorneys for Plaintiff,
California Civil Rights Department

(Fee Exempt, Gov. Code, § 6103)

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA

CALIFORNIA CIVIL RIGHTS DEPARTMENT, an agency of the State of California,

Plaintiff,

v.

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC., a California Corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. 20CV372366

JOINT STATEMENT FOR INFORMAL DISCOVERY CONFERENCE

Date: November 15, 2024
Time: 9:30 AM
Department 16
Judge: Hon. Amber Rosen

Action Filed: October 16, 2020
Trial Date: TBD

LYNNE C. HERMLE (STATE BAR NO. 99779)
lchermle@orrick.com
JOSEPH C. LIBURT (STATE BAR NO. 155507)
jliburt@orrick.com
NICHOLAS J. HORTON (STATE BAR NO. 289417)
nhorton@orrick.com
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
1000 Marsh Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025-1015
Telephone: +1 650 614 7400
Facsimile: +1 650 614 7401

Attorneys for Defendant

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.

Plaintiff California Civil Rights Department (CRD) and Defendant Cisco have requested an informal discovery conference (IDC) with the Court on **November 15, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.** to resolve issues concerning its Requests for Production of Documents, Set One (Requests) (Exhibit 1.) CRD filed this action on October 16, 2020. CRD served its Requests on January 1, 2021. After the filing of several preliminary motions, the Court stayed discovery. Discovery was paused again to pursue mediation. On December 5, 2022, after the Court lifted the discovery stay, Cisco provided responses to CRD's Requests. (Exhibit 2.) On April 26, 2024, Cisco served amended responses to CRD's Requests. (Exhibit 3.)

The parties have engaged in extensive meet and confer efforts to resolve remaining disputes concerning CRD's Requests. Since June 2024, the parties have exchanged numerous meet and confer letters and emails regarding the Requests. (Exhibit 4.) On October 8, 2024, Cisco sent an email to CRD confirming that the parties had reached an impasse on certain discrete issues. (Exhibit 5.) Accordingly, the parties have reduced the discovery in dispute to Request Nos. 24, 25, 31, 32, 35, 37, 39-44, and 70. The parties are unable to resolve their differences as to these requests and now seek the Court's assistance.

I. CRD'S STATEMENT

The requests at issue seek communications involving Cisco personnel regarding caste discrimination or harassment (Request Nos. 24-25), disciplinary records of relevant management personnel (Request Nos. 31, 32, 35, 37, 39-44), and records of complaints and investigations (Request No. 70). Through the meet and confer process, CRD has attempted to narrow the scope of the requests at issue by proposing tailored search terms and custodians and by limiting the relevant period. However, Cisco has been unwilling to deviate from its positions that it will not produce communications unless they explicitly contain the word "caste," that personnel files of only two managers are relevant even though real party in interest Chetan Narsude (Mr. Narsude) was supervised by additional managers at Cisco, and that only Mr. Narsude's complaint of discrimination is responsive to CRD's request for all complaints of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation in California. Though CRD has not moved to compel further responses yet, should it choose to do so, CRD can establish good cause both by showing why the information it seeks is relevant to the claims and defenses alleged and by stating facts showing that Cisco

has taken an overly narrow view of discovery in violation of CRD's broad right to discovery under the Discovery Act.[1]

A. Request Nos. 24 and 25

These requests seek communications involving Cisco personnel regarding caste discrimination or harassment. Cisco initially objected to the production of these records but stated it was willing to meet and confer on search terms. CRD agreed to limit the scope of these requests to Cisco human resources and employee relations staff in California as well as Cisco employees in Mr. Narsude's working group (the Candid organization) during his employment with Cisco. CRD further proposed a list of search terms including: (1) Color /s dark; (2) Color /s discriminat!; (3) Skin s/ dark; (4) Untouchab!; (5) Scheduled /s caste; (6) Caste; (7) Castism; (8) Rank; (9) Stigma;! (10) Class /s low!; (11) India! /s ancestry; (12) India! /s origin; (13) Dalit; (14) Hind!; (15) Relig! /s custom; (16) Relig! /s belief; (17) Bully!; (18) Outcast; (19) Retaliation /s ancestry; (20) Retaliation /s relig!; and (21) Affirmative action.[2] Cisco contends that CRD's search terms yielded around 348,000 results and informed CRD that it was therefore unable to agree to such search terms. (Exhibit 6.) Instead, Cisco proposed a search consisting of the word "caste" within 15 words of discrimin*, harass*, or retaliate*, the results of which are mainly "Google alert-type messages from third parties with links to the many articles written about this lawsuit." (Exhibit 7.)

Cisco's position and proposed limited search is problematic for several reasons. First, these requests are not expressly limited to communications containing the word "caste." Second, CRD's proposed search terms are specifically tailored to retrieve responsive communications that may not include the term "caste," though they may be concerning discrimination or harassment on the basis of caste. This is critical because those discussing, describing, or experiencing caste discrimination or harassment may not explicitly use the word "caste," for a variety of reasons, including self-exposure or fear of retaliation

[1] A party "may obtain discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, that is relevant to the subject matter involved . . . if the matter either is itself admissible in evidence or appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence." (Code Civ. Proc., § 2017.010.) The "relevance to the subject matter standard" should be construed "in accordance with the liberal policies underlying the discovery procedures," and any "doubts as to relevance should generally be resolved in favor of permitting the discovery." (*Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court* (1982) 31 Cal.3d 785, 790.)

[2] Cisco's position statement, *infra*, cherry picks and disputes several of CRD's proposed search terms in an effort to invalidate *every* proposed search. Despite the straw person, CRD has never opposed negotiating and/or refining the search terms it proposed. For example, "Hind!" could easily be modified to Hindu or Hindi. CRD has consistently welcomed further discussion of its proposed searches, yet Cisco has refused to agree to any search that does not start with "caste." This is tantamount to refusing any search that does not start with "race" in a race discrimination case.

By way of example, CRD's amended complaint explains how Mr. Narsude's team was composed of higher caste supervisors and co-workers who created a discriminatory environment for lower caste employees such as Mr. Narsude. Therefore, CRD's proposed term of "Class /s low!" potentially identifies communications or issues raised at Cisco relating to caste. Third, CRD is not required to settle for a document production that is largely irrelevant. CRD is not suggesting that casting a wider net will eliminate *all* unresponsive results, as Cisco contends *infra*. Rather, a wider net is also potentially likely to return additional relevant communications besides "Google alert-type messages." Accordingly, CRD does not agree with Cisco's "caste or nothing" approach to search terms for potentially relevant communications.

Lastly, Cisco fails to provide any evidence as to why CRD's search terms create an undue burden. An "objection based upon burden must be sustained by evidence showing the quantum of work required." (*Williams v. Superior Court* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 531, 550 citing *West Pico Furniture Co. v. Superior Court* (1961) 56 Cal.2d 407, 417.) Cisco's refusal to agree to CRD's proposed search terms is based on nothing more than the number of search results. It fails to identify any evidence to support its undue burden argument, such as how long a review for responsive communications might take, the costs required for the review, or whether the proposed search terms could be further narrowed to reduce nonresponsive results, which CRD has expressed a willingness to discuss

B. Request Nos. 31, 32, 35, 37, and 39-44

These requests seek documents reflecting discipline or counseling, whether inside or outside of the formal performance review process, of Cisco personnel who managed Mr. Narsude during his employment. Cisco argues that discovery must be limited to alleged conduct by Cisco employees Iyer and Kompella.

CRD disagrees with Cisco's position, and for good reason. First, these requests seek information relevant to the claims and defenses in this matter, including CRD's claim alleging failure to prevent discrimination and harassment (Govt. Code, § 12940, subd. (k).) It is highly relevant whether and to what extent Cisco took remedial action -with its personnel accused of wrongdoing, especially relating to allegations of discrimination or harassment generally. Further, the requested records will potentially ascertain the attitude of relevant managers at Cisco and relatedly, the workplace culture. Indeed, numerous

courts in California and at the federal level have held that evidence of the general working atmosphere is not just discoverable, but plainly *admissible*.[3] Second, the scope is proper. The individuals identified supervised Mr. Narsude during the relevant time period.

To the extent Cisco raises issues of privacy to avoid producing responsive information, those concerns are overstated. CRD is fully entitled to discover information concerning Cisco's workforce and their related experiences. (See *Williams v. Superior Court* (2017) 3 Cal.5th 531, 544 [noting that "[l]imiting discovery would grant the defendant a monopoly on access to its customers or employees and their experiences and artificially tilt the scales in the ensuing litigation"].)

C. Request No. 70

This request seeks documents relating to complaints of discrimination, harassment, and/or retaliation since 2012. The parties previously agreed to limit the request to complaints in California. However, CRD has made clear that this request is not limited to only complaints raising caste, despite Cisco's efforts to so narrow the scope of this request.

The parties previously agreed to discuss search terms prior to Cisco conducting searches for complaints raising caste. However, prior to agreeing to such search terms, Cisco claims to have already reviewed every California complaint "based on religion, ancestry, national origin, ethnicity, race, color, or caste" and deemed only Mr. Narsude's complaint responsive. Cisco did not disclose its search terms or methodology for identifying such complaints it claims to have reviewed. Accordingly, CRD proposed tailored search terms to Cisco, similar to those it proposed for Request Nos. 24 and 25, discussed *supra*. As with other communications, it cannot be assumed that individuals raising issues of caste in complaints will use "magic words" or express issues in terms of protected categories. Therefore, CRD believes that the addition of the previously proposed search terms would provide a more thorough search for responsive

[3] See *Fisher v. San Pedro Peninsula Hospital* (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 590, 610 ["Evidence of the general work atmosphere, involving employees other than the plaintiff, is relevant to the issue of whether there existed an atmosphere of hostile work environment."]. CRD has plainly alleged the existence of a hostile work environment. Further, by nature, the "general work atmosphere" may extend to issues reasonably related to caste. See also *Heyne v. Caruso* (9th Cir. 1995) 69 F.3d 1475, 1479 ["It is clear that an employer's conduct tending to demonstrate hostility towards a certain group is both relevant and admissible where the employer's general hostility towards that group is the true reason behind [an adverse action against] a member of that group."]. Cisco is wrong that only hostility toward the protected category alleged is relevant. Evidence of a discriminatory attitude *in general* is sufficiently discoverable. See *Heyne*, 69 F.3d at pp. 1479-80, citing *United States Postal Serv. Bd. of Governors v. Aikens*, 460 U.S. 711, 716 ["[T]he Supreme Court held that evidence of the employer's discriminatory attitude *in general* is relevant and admissible to prove race discrimination."] [emphasis original].

complaints. Notably, Cisco has not provided the volume of results CRD's searches would yield, nor any other evidence of undue burden in performing the searches and reviewing the results.

Complaints of discrimination and harassment not raising caste (whether implicitly or explicitly) are also relevant and discoverable and should be produced. In defending against CRD's claim that Cisco failed to take all reasonable steps to prevent discrimination or harassment, Cisco will undoubtedly rely on policies and remedial measures that are *not* specific to caste. In fact, Cisco admits that it does not have policies or procedures specific to caste-based discrimination and does not intend to limit its defense of the claim to how it prevents or handles allegations of caste discrimination. Therefore, CRD is prejudiced if Cisco is free to use policies and evidence fundamentally *not* specific to (or even intended to address) caste discrimination or harassment when, on the other hand, CRD is limited to discovering complaints raising caste, of which Cisco claims there is only Mr. Narsude's. Accordingly, CRD should be entitled to discover complaints and evidence of remedial measures regarding allegations of discrimination or harassment based on characteristics reasonably related to caste, such as religion, ancestry, national origin, ethnicity, race, or color. CRD is willing to discuss the parameters of such a production.

II. CISCO'S STATEMENT

CRD misstates Cisco's position and demands Cisco review hundreds of thousands of documents that are not reasonably likely to have any relevance to any issue in this case. CRD also demands complaints and disciplinary actions unrelated to caste discrimination, the sole form of discrimination relevant to its claims. This case is about the claims of a single highly paid software developer who did not get along with his supervisors, peers, or subordinates and alleged caste-based complaints. Discovery is appropriately limited to Mr. Narsude's allegations and other caste-based complaints in California, if any, because, even under CRD's failure to prevent claim, the issue is whether Cisco failed to prevent **caste** discrimination, harassment, and retaliation in California. *See* Second Am. Compl. ¶¶ 85-89, 95-96. Evidence of other forms of discrimination, harassment, or retaliation are plainly irrelevant. The Court should not permit such overreaching, broad, and irrelevant discovery.

A. Request Nos. 24 and 25

CRD's argument misses the mark. Cisco has never contended that communications about caste discrimination or harassment in California are not discoverable. Instead, Cisco argues that CRD's search

terms for these requests are not reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of such communications and that the burden of reviewing 348,000 documents based on CRD's speculation significantly outweighs the likelihood that admissible evidence will be discovered using these terms. CRD cannot meet its burden showing good cause to require Cisco to review over 348,000 documents. A party moving to compel further responses "shall set forth specific facts showing good cause justifying the discovery sought." Cal. Code Civ. Proc. ("CCP") § 2031.310(b)(1). Good cause requires both: (1) relevance to the subject matter; and (2) specific facts justifying discovery. *Glenfed Dev. Corp. v. Sup. Ct.*, 53 Cal. App. 4th 1113, 1117 (1997) Simple "argument" or "mere generalities" fail. *Calcor Space Facility, Inc. v. Sup. Ct.*, 53 Cal. App. 4th 216, 224–25 (1997). Only if the moving party can show good cause does the burden shift to the opposing party to justify its objections. *Kirkland v. Sup. Ct.*, 95 Cal. App. 4th 92, 98 (2002). CRD has not shown good cause for such a voluminous review based on speculative search terms.

These requests are expressly limited to communications "about discrimination or harassment on the basis of caste." (Exhibit 1) However, CRD's proposed search terms are not narrowly tailored to identify such communications. During meet and confer, CRD refused to respond to Cisco's request to explain or narrow its requested search terms, relying instead on its speculation that employees may not use "magic words" when discussing "caste" discrimination or harassment. (Exhibit 4 [August 2 and 21, 2024 letters) CRD's speculation is insufficient to meet its burden to show good cause for these overbroad search terms because it has no "specific facts justifying" the use of these search terms. *Glenfed*, 53 Cal App. 4th at 1117.

CRD also speculates, without any evidentiary support, that its search terms "are specifically tailored to retrieve responsive communications that may not include the term 'caste'." Not so. Cisco evaluated CRD's proposed search terms across more than 350 custodians and the preliminary results yielded over 348,000 documents for review in this single complainant action.[4] While the sheer volume of

[4] CRD complains that Cisco did not provide evidence during meet and confer supporting the burden of reviewing 348,000 documents. That is putting the cart before the horse. CRD has not met its burden of providing specific factual evidence that these terms are reasonably likely to identify communications about caste discrimination or harassment and has no evidentiary basis for its unfounded assumption that employees may not use the word "caste" when complaining of caste discrimination. *Glenfed*, 53 Cal. App. 4th at 1117. In any event, the burden is self-evident. Conservatively assuming an average review time of five minutes per document would require 29,000 hours of review. Assuming Cisco engaged contract reviewers at a rate of $50 per hour (Cisco is currently paying $85 per hour for third party contract reviewers), Cisco would need to expend at least $1,450,000 to simply do a first pass review of these documents. Cisco would then incur additional costs of having case team attorneys review potentially responsive documents for relevance and privilege.

documents evidences that the terms are not "specifically tailored to retrieve responsive communications," the deficiencies in CRD's proposed terms are also facially apparent. For example, the term "Hind!" would require Cisco to review documents that contain the words **hind**sight, **hind**er, **hind**ers, and **hind**ered; none of which have any reasonable relation to "caste". Likewise, the terms "rank" and "affirmative action" can be used in innumerable ways that have nothing to do with caste. The absence of specific facts supporting CRD's speculation is fatal to CRD's requested relief. These are not simply cherrypicked examples and changing the term "Hind!" to Hindu or Hindi does not make it any more likely to find communications about caste discrimination or harassment. CRD had an opportunity to refine its search terms or counteroffer Cisco's proposed terms and refused to do so. CRD's refusal to do so belies its current attempt to excuse its failure to negotiate search terms in good faith, and CRD's last-minute generic statement that it was willing to continue discussing terms after already refusing to do so rings hollow.

In response to CRD's overbroad and irrelevant search terms, Cisco offered to search for the word "caste" within the same sentence as discrimination, harassment, or retaliation (i.e., within 15 words) because that is what the requests seek. Cisco's proposed search yielded over 1,400 documents for review across the same custodians. Cisco reviewed those documents and is prepared to produce communications "about discrimination or harassment on the basis of caste" identified during that review, about half of which were arguably responsive to CRD's overbroad requests. Most of these documents are google alert type messages that contain links to articles about this lawsuit. Other documents show that some employees asked what Cisco was doing in response to seeing CRD's allegations in news articles and specifically used the term "caste" when raising these questions. Curiously, CRD asserts that it cannot agree to Cisco's narrower search terms because those terms "returned primarily irrelevant information." (Exhibit 5 [October 7, 2024 email]) CRD's response exemplifies the flaws in its reasoning. If searching for "caste" within the same sentence as discrimination, harassment, or retaliation "returned primarily irrelevant information," CRD's broader terms that are completely disconnected from "caste" are likely to yield far more "irrelevant information." *See* Code Civ. Proc., § 2017.020, subd. (a).) ("The court shall limit the scope of discovery if it determines that the burden, expense, or intrusiveness of that discovery clearly outweighs the likelihood that the information sought will lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.") CRD's desire to make Cisco to expend at least 29,000 hours and millions of dollars (*see* fn. 3) reviewing

hundreds of thousands of documents that are not reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence should not be endorsed by this Court.

B. Request Nos. 31, 32, 35, 37, 39-44

Request Nos. 31, 32, 35, 37, and 39-44 seek the employee personnel files of various of Narsude's managers. Despite agreeing during meet and confer to focus on caste-based complaints against Iyer and Kompella,[5] CRD is now improperly seeking to expand discovery to any complaint or discipline against any of the managers listed in these requests, including complaints or disciplinary action unrelated to caste-based complaints.

Contrary to CRD's suggestion, CRD does not have good reason to expand discovery beyond the issues pled in its complaint. This case is about caste; nothing else. *See Crowe v. Wiltel Comm.*, 103 F.3d 897, 900 (9th Cir. 1996) (court properly excluded evidence of sexual orientation and race discrimination in case alleging gender discrimination); *Kelly v. Boeing Petroleum Servs.*, 61 F.3d 350, 357 (5th Cir. 1995) (in disability case, comments regarding race, sex and other categories irrelevant); *Rauh v. Coyne*, 744 F Supp. 1181, 1183 (D.D.C. 1990) (rejecting an "all-purpose discriminator" theory: "There is little reason to infer that an employer who discriminates against blacks in employment decisions is also likely to discriminate against women").

CRD misstates the law when it contends that any evidence of general work atmosphere is "plainly admissible" under California and federal law. As noted above, such evidence is ***plainly inadmissible*** unless it relates to caste. *See Crowe*, 103 F.3d at 900; *Kelly*, 61 F.3d at 357; *Rauh*, 744 F. Supp. At 1183. Instead of addressing the issue head on, CRD reaches its improper legal conclusion by ignoring the holdings of *Fisher* and *Heyne* and quoting them out of context. In *Fisher v. San Pedro Peninsula Hospital*, 214 Cal.App.3d 590, 610 (1989), the court addressed the higher burden for a plaintiff who was not a direct victim of sexual harassment, holding the plaintiff must have personally witnessed the sexual harassment and must describe how sexual harassment was pervasive in her presence. *Fisher's* reasoning clearly supports Cisco's position because the *Fisher* court required plaintiff to present evidence of witnessing the specific alleged unlawful conduct at issue, which, here, is caste. In *Heyne v. Caruso*, 69 F.3d 1475, 1479

[5] Cisco confirmed to CRD during meet and confer that there are no caste-based complaints against the managers listed in these requests other than the allegations raised by Mr. Narsude.

(9th Cir. 1995), the Ninth Circuit held that "an employer's conduct tending to demonstrate hostility towards a certain group is both relevant and admissible where the employer's general hostility towards that group is the true reason behind [an adverse action against] a member of that group." *Heyne* clearly supports Cisco's position that any alleged general hostility must be related to the type of hostility alleged, here hostility based on caste. CRD also misrepresents the holding of *United States Postal Serv. Bd. Of Governor v. Aikens*, 460 U.S. 711 (1983), by relying on a quote from *Heyne* that incorrectly summarizes dictum from a footnote in *Aikens*, not its holding. Contrary to CRD's contention, *Aikens* did not hold that any evidence of a "an employer's discriminatory attitude in general is relevant and admissible to prove race discrimination," as suggested by *Heyne* and CRD. *Aikens* did not address this issue at all. Instead, *Aikens'* holding relates to whether the lower courts properly applied the *McDonnell Douglas* burden shifting framework. However, in a footnote, the Supreme Court noted the plaintiff "introduced testimony that the person responsible for the promotion decisions at issue had made numerous derogatory comments about blacks in general and Aikens in particular." 460 U.S. at 713, n. 2. This dictum does not support discovery into non-caste related complaints or general workplace hostility unrelated to caste. Instead, as with CRD's other cases, it only suggests that evidence of general race-based animus by the person alleged to have engaged in unlawful race discrimination may be relevant in a case alleging race discrimination. Thus, *Aikens* not only supports Cisco's position that the discovery should be limited to caste-based complaints, but also supports limiting such discovery to those managers alleged to have discriminated against Mr. Narsude, specifically Mr. Iyer and Mr. Kompella. CRD seemingly agrees with this limitation. *See* Section II.B. (arguing "whether and to what extent Cisco took remedial action with its **personnel accused of wrongdoing**" is "highly relevant") (emphasis added).

CRD has not offered any factual or legal support for its position that it is entitled to expand discovery beyond caste-based issues. This Court should not expand discovery beyond the pleadings.

C. Request No. 70

Request No. 70 seeks "complaints, charges, arbitrations, or lawsuits alleging discrimination, harassment, and/or retaliation from any person from 2012 to present." CRD raises two disputes with Cisco's response to this request.

///

First, CRD contends Cisco's search based on an agreed limitation was inadequate. During meet and confer, CRD recognized that this request was overbroad and the parties agreed to limit the request to complaints of caste-based discrimination, harassment, and/or retaliation in California from 2012 to present. CRD expressed the same concern as noted above that an employee may not use "magic words" when making a caste-based complaint. Accordingly, Cisco agreed to review any complaints in California related to religion, ancestry, national origin, ethnicity, race, color, or caste to see if any suggested or implied caste was at issue. Cisco initially located only Mr. Narsude's complaint as being caste-related.[6] CRD now disavows its prior agreement and wants Cisco to review those same complaints again using search terms that are narrower than what Cisco already used. There is no reason to make Cisco redo its search.

Second, CRD seeks (again) to expand discovery beyond the pleadings. As noted above, evidence of other forms of alleged discrimination is plainly inadmissible to prove caste-based mistreatment. *See Crowe*, 103 F.3d at 900; *Kelly*, 61 F.3d at 357; *Rauh*, 744 F. Supp. At 1183. Presumably unhappy that the agreed-upon review of complaints did not yield the results it wanted, CRD now contends that it is entitled to any complaint of any form of discrimination because "Cisco will undoubtedly rely on policies and remedial measures that are *not* specific to caste" in defense of this case. CRD's untenable position is that unless Cisco's policies expressly include the word "caste", Cisco cannot rely on those policies unless it also produces every non-caste-based complaint. CRD's argument is nonsensical. FEHA does not expressly use the word "caste", but CRD is suing Cisco for alleged violations of FEHA. The same holds true for Cisco's policies, which align to FEHA. Cisco's policies prohibit all forms of discrimination and also list certain legally protected categories (e.g., those listed in FEHA). These policies are not rendered irrelevant simply because they align to the law and do not expressly include the word "caste". Nor does relying on such policies open the door to every non-caste-based complaint, which are plainly inadmissible. As Cisco has reiterated numerous times in meet and confer, Cisco's policies prohibit all forms of discrimination, harassment, and retaliation and it intends to rely on those policies by explaining how those policies apply to the caste-based allegations in this case – indeed,

[6] Cisco has since located one additional complaint that discussed caste issues in society but expressly disavowed caste discrimination occurred at Cisco, which Cisco has agreed to produce.

Narsude used those policies to complain about caste. As Cisco also told CRD in meet and confer, Cisco is not opening the door to other non-caste complaints because Cisco does not intend to rely on how it responded to any non-caste-based complaint in defense of this action. There is no basis in fact or law for CRD's position, and the Court should reject CRD's request to expand discovery beyond the pleadings to plainly irrelevant and inadmissible evidence.

Dated: November 7, 2024

CALIFORNIA CIVIL RIGHTS DEPARTMENT

/s/ Rumduol Vuong
Rumduol Vuong
Attorneys for the CRD

CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.

/s/ Nicholas J. Horton
Nicholas J. Horton
Attorney for Cisco

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Carolina Arana, the undersigned, hereby declare:

I am over eighteen years of age and not a party to the within cause. My business address is 555 12th Street, Suite 2050, Oakland, CA 94607. My electronic service address is Carolina.Arana@calcivilrights.ca.gov.

On the date below, I served the following document(s) via Electronic Service:

- **JOINT STATEMENT FOR INFORMAL DISCOVERY CONFERENCE**

in the case *CRD v. Cisco Systems, Inc. et al,* Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No.: 20CV372366, to the person(s) listed below at the following amended e-mail address(es):

Lynne C. Hermle lchermle@orrick.com Joseph C. Liburt jliburt@orrick.com Nicholas J. Horton nhorton@orrick.com Attorneys for Defendant Cisco Systems, Inc.	

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on **November 1, 2024**, at Oakland, CA.

Carolina Arana, Legal Secretary
CA Civil Rights Department (formerly DFEH)