

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

HASSAN H. SHERIF : CIVIL ACTION  
: :  
: :  
v. : :  
: :  
ASTRAZENECA, L.P., et al. : NO. 00-CV-3285

MEMORANDUM & ORDER

J.M. KELLY, J.

JUNE 18, 2001

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Clarification of the May 16, 2001, Order or, for Reconsideration of Plaintiff's Motion for Protective Order, and the response thereto by the defendants. There is nothing in Plaintiff's Motion that warrants a reconsideration for the reason that: (a) new evidence is available, (b) that intervening change in law occurred, or (c) that the Court made a manifest error of law as required by Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir.), cert. denied, 476 U.S. 1171 (1986). Plaintiff further contends that defendant's motive for contacting plaintiff's current employer is because the defendant may cause to blacken the plaintiff's reputation with his current employer. It is certainly relevant for the defendant, in a money damages matter, to discover the financial prospects of the plaintiff. In an attempt to balance the concerns of the parties in this matter, the following Order shall be entered.

1. Defendants are permitted to contact plaintiff's

employer to determine plaintiff's current earnings and his potential earning capacity.

2. Defendants are prohibited from discussing with his current employer the reasons defendants aver plaintiff was from separated from his previous employment with the defendants.

BY THE COURT:

---

JAMES MCGIRR KELLY, J.