

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

Libertarian Party of Ohio,
et al., :
Plaintiffs, :
v. : Case No. 2:13-cv-953
Jon Husted, et al., : JUDGE MICHAEL H. WATSON
Defendants. : Magistrate Judge Kemp

OPINION AND ORDER

This case, the background of which appears in many other orders of the Court and which will not be repeated here, is before the Court to resolve a number of pending discovery-related motions. The substantive issues raised in those motions are all moot; discovery is complete. This order addresses the issue of whether any discovery sanctions should be imposed.

I. Unresolved Requests for Sanctions

Plaintiffs requested sanctions under Rule 37(a)(5) in their motion to compel Gregory Felsoci, the intervenor defendant, to produce documents (Doc. 299); in a separate motion for sanctions which addresses that and other aspects of discovery (Doc. 300); in their second motion to compel Mr. Felsoci's deposition (Doc. 316); and in their renewed motion to compel production of documents from non-party Matt Borges (Doc. 326). Each motion raises the question of whether the party opposing discovery - primarily Mr. Felsoci - did so in a way which was substantially justified.

A. The Rule 26(e) Issue

The most comprehensive motion is Doc. 300. It summarizes various difficulties with discovery, all of which are addressed

on their merits in prior court orders, and concludes that Mr. Felsoci's participation in this case was "political espionage" designed to thwart legitimate discovery and that his tactics were "of the 'scorched earth' variety." Id. at 2-3. Plaintiffs detail how difficult it was for them to uncover the fact that Terry Casey, a Republican Party operative, was paying Mr. Felsoci's legal fees in this case, and that money to do so was supplied directly by the Ohio Republican Party; how hard it was to compel Mr. Felsoci to sit for a deposition; how Mr. Felsoci's lawyers refused to supplement discovery responses to show that Mr. Casey or the Ohio Republican Party had made additional payments toward Mr. Felsoci's legal fees; and how Mr. Felsoci's lawyers did not fulfill their professional obligations to Mr. Felsoci when they did not inform him of their joint representation of himself and Mr. Casey and the agreement Mr. Casey made to pay Mr. Felsoci's legal fees - a failure which allowed Mr. Felsoci to deny any knowledge of who was paying his legal fees. The motion concludes by arguing that there was never any justification for Mr. Felsoci's failure voluntarily to produce documents showing that the Ohio Republican Party had made additional payments in 2015 toward Mr. Felsoci's legal fees - those documents are the subject of the motion to compel which is Doc. 299 - and it asks for sanctions including a default judgment against Mr. Felsoci on Count Seven of the complaint.

In his opposing memorandum (which also opposes the request for sanctions made in Doc. 299), Mr. Felsoci points out that he did supply Plaintiffs with the supplemental documentation about payments of legal fees which are the subject of Doc. 299, and did so promptly after receiving a supplemental document request, something the Court suggested to Plaintiffs' counsel during a telephone conference held with respect to that motion. He argues that he had no obligation to do so prior to that, even though the

invoices were requested by Plaintiffs earlier in the case, because when that request was made, these particular invoices did not exist. He contends that there is a split of authority about whether later-created documents must be produced in response to a document request when the earlier production was complete when made. The 20-page reply memorandum (Doc. 306), which reads like a treatise on the duty to supplement found in Rule 26(e), disputes that such a split of authority exists and contends that Mr. Felsoci's argument about the materiality of the documents is so clearly incorrect that sanctions are appropriate.

As Mr. Felsoci portrays it, the cases are split on the question of whether a party must supplement a prior document production with documents which are responsive to the request but which did not exist at the time the original production was made. He relies on, among other cases, Judge Litkovitz' decision in Rhein v. Smyth Automotive, Inc., 2012 WL 3150953 (S.D. Ohio Aug. 2, 2012), as supporting that thesis. There, one of the document requests asked for sales reports from January 1, 2005 to the present. Defendants produced all such reports through the date of their initial response but did not supplement that production as additional reports were created. The Court ordered only a portion of these new reports to be produced, reasoning that given "the strong policy favoring liberal discovery" and given that defendants themselves were relying on such reports which post-dated the original document production, the plaintiff was entitled to the supplemental documents to the extent they were relevant. The Court also held, however, that an open-ended document request could not force a responding party to produce wholly irrelevant documents, even if they were responsive, because such documents could not render an earlier response incomplete or incorrect when made, which is the trigger for the duty to supplement as set out in Rule 26(e). Mr. Felsoci also

cites to a case relied on in Rhein, MSC Software Corp. v. Altair Engineering, Inc., 2012 WL 1340445, *2 (E.D. Mich. Apr. 18, 2012), which stated, although not in its direct holding, that "Rule 26(e) does not place a continuing burden on a party responding to a discovery request to supplement with new information." Also, there is a statement in a less recent case, Kingsway Financial Services, Inc. v. Pricewaterhouse-Coopers LLP, 2006 WL 1295409, *2 (S.D.N.Y. May 10, 2006), that "[s]urprisingly, with the exception of an unpublished and uncitable decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, I have been unable to find any precedents addressing whether documents created after the service of a Rule 34 response need be produced in response thereto." That court concluded that "[s]ubsequently created documents do not render a previously served document response incomplete as of the date of the response" and that even if they did, the rules did not specify how frequently responses to document requests had to be updated.

Plaintiffs certainly have the stronger argument that these cases, read closely, do not necessarily suggest a different rule about the duty to supplement with after-created documents; rather, they allow room for parties to debate whether responsive but irrelevant documents must be disclosed in a supplemental production, or whether open-ended requests for documents may ultimately create an undue burden on the producing party which would excuse production. But this illustrates that the point is arguable. Certainly, the Kingsway decision provides a fair amount of support for Mr. Felsoci's position. Were the Court called upon simply to decide the question of whether Mr. Felsoci had a duty to supplement where, as here, the after-created documents were few in number and directly relevant to Plaintiffs' claims, it would probably side with Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs have

the documents now, however, and the substantive issue is moot. Can the Court also say that Mr. Felsoci's position lacked substantial justification in a way that merits sanctions? That is a close call, but there is just enough justification for his argument that it falls on the non-sanctionable side. Perhaps with more development of the case law, his position will become untenable and sanctionable, but the Court cannot make that determination here, even though Mr. Felsoci would have been better-advised to produce the documents either voluntarily or in response to Plaintiffs' express request to supplement his earlier production. However, that spirit of cooperation has been absent in this case from the outset.

B. The Second Felsoci Deposition

The second motion to compel a deposition of Mr. Felsoci also contains a request for sanctions. By way of brief background, Mr. Felsoci was deposed once in this case, pursuant to a court order issued after he objected to being deposed at all, so when Plaintiffs requested a second deposition, leave of court was required under Fed.R.Civ.P. 30(a). The basis for the request was the production of documents showing that the Ohio Republican Party was paying Mr. Felsoci's legal bills. Plaintiffs assert in their motion that Mr. Felsoci had no reasonable basis for refusing their request. They rely on this Court's decision in Fresenius Medical Care Holdings, Inc. v. Roxane laboratories, Inc., 2007 WL 764302 (S.D. Ohio March 9, 2007) for the proposition that if important documents surface after the first deposition of a witness has been taken, a second deposition is routinely permitted. After a conference with the Court, Mr. Felsoci agreed to submit to a brief second deposition, but the parties were apparently unable to come to agreement as to the parameters of that deposition. The Court subsequently issued a brief order directing that the deposition go forward (Doc. 322).

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.