

1 2. The petitioners in this action had previously noted depositions of Mr. Logan and
2 Mr. Huennekens for March 15, 2005, and March 17, 2005, respectively. Prior to
3 the scheduled depositions, counsel for the intervenor-respondent Washington
4 State Democratic Central Committee (“democrats”) asked that the depositions be
5 postponed to allow more time for the acquisition and review of documents sought
6 from King County. Counsel for petitioners agreed to postpone the depositions,
7 but indicated that they would re-note the depositions no later than the week of
8 March 28, 2005.

9 3. On March 17, 2005, on behalf of Mr. Logan and Mr. Huennekens, I accepted
10 service of deposition notices by the petitioners resetting the depositions for Mr.
11 Logan and Mr. Huennekens for March 28 and March 31, respectively.

12 4. Also on March 17, in a letter, counsel for the democrats stated that they have not
13 yet received necessary documents from King County and documents sought from
14 petitioners in discovery, and that, therefore, the democrats are not prepared to take
15 the depositions on the scheduled dates. Counsel for the democrats asserted a right
16 to both cross examine Mr. Logan and Mr. Huennekens at the petitioners’
17 depositions and to set separate depositions of the same witnesses at some later
18 unspecified dates.

19 5. Mr. Logan and Mr. Huennekens are both ready and willing to be deposed on
20 March 28 and March 31, respectively. However, neither Mr. Logan nor Mr.
21 Huennekens believes it is reasonable or appropriate that they be required to
22 submit to multiple depositions by the parties at different times. Requiring them to
23 submit to multiple depositions is unduly burdensome to them personally and to

