



However, the Court also recognizes that the administrative law judge in Jewell's proceeding issued a protective order in the administrative proceeding, and the Court is inclined to give deference to that order.

Thus, this Court **DENIES** Jewell's Motion to Quash but **GRANTS** her Motion for Protective Order. Specifically, the Court **MODIFIES** the TEA subpoena such that any production in response to the issues Jewell raises (Request 1(d) and (e) and Request 2) is limited to the production of documents concerning complaints made to the TEA about any employee-on-student harassment, misconduct, abuse, grooming, or other similar sexually inappropriate behavior for the time period the subpoena specifies and any related investigations. Additionally, any documents produced by the TEA shall be designated as Attorneys Eyes Only under the Protective Order in this case, Dkt. No. 57. If Doe believes that something the TEA produces should not remain under an Attorneys Eyes Only designation, Doe may move to de-designate as needed using the Court's discovery dispute process after conferring with Jewell's attorneys.

**B. Discovery Dispute Chart**

The parties' discovery dispute chart contains the following eight issues: (1) whether LISD has fully responded to Doe's Interrogatory No. 5 and her Request for Production Nos. 11 and 49; (2) whether LISD's objections to Does Interrogatory No. 3 are valid and whether LISD has properly responded despite its objections; (3) whether LISD's objections to Does Interrogatory No. 10 are valid and whether LISD has properly responded despite its objections; (4) whether LISD properly responded to Doe's Request for Production No. 32; (5) whether LISD properly responded to Doe's Request for Production No. 33; (6) whether LISD properly responded to Doe's Request for Production No. 64; (7) whether LISD properly responded to Doe's Request for Production No. 66; and (8) whether LISD's privilege log is deficient. As to all issues, the Court

**DENIES** Doe's request for sanctions, but notes that if, at any point, the parties discover what appears to be some type of bad faith or impropriety, the parties may raise those issues at that point. As to each specific issue, the Court further **ORDERS** as follows:

(1) Doe's requested relief is **DENIED**.

(2) LISD's objections to Doe's Interrogatory No. 3 are **OVERRULED** and LISD must update its response considering the overruling of its objections and to specifically indicate responsive documents by accurate Bates range.

(3) LISD must respond to the interrogatory, but any response is limited to claims of employee-on-student harassment, misconduct, abuse, grooming, or similar behaviors. The balance of Doe's requested relief is **DENIED**.

(4) Doe's requested relief is **DENIED** and LISD identify responsive documents by accurate Bates range in the production LISD has already made.

(5) Doe's requested relief is **DENIED** and LISD identify responsive documents by accurate Bates range in the production LISD has already made.

(6) Doe's requested relief is **DENIED** and LISD identify responsive documents by accurate Bates range in the production LISD has already made.

(7) LISD must produce documents responsive to the request, but any production is limited to claims of employee-on-student harassment, misconduct, abuse, grooming, or similar behaviors. The balance of Doe's requested relief is **DENIED**.

(8) Doe's requested relief is **DENIED**.

**SIGNED** this 7th day of May, 2026.

  
DAN N. MACLEMORE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE