

The Honorable Richard A. Jones

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

DEBORAH FRAME-WILSON, CHRISTIAN
SABOL, SAMANTHIA RUSSELL, ARTHUR
SCHAREIN, LIONEL KEROS, NATHAN
CHANEY, CHRIS GULLEY, SHERYL
TAYLOR-HOLLY, ANTHONY COURTNEY,
DAVE WESTROPE, STACY DUTILL,
SARAH ARRINGTON, MARY ELLIOT,
HEATHER GEESEY, STEVE MORTILLARO,
CHAUNDA LEWIS, ADRIEN HENNEN,
GLENDA R. HILL, GAIL MURPHY,
PHYLLIS HUSTER, and GERRY
KOCHENDORFER, on behalf of themselves
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AMAZON.COM, INC., a Delaware
corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:20-cv-00424-RAJ

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL
26(F) CONFERENCE UNDER FEDERAL
RULE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 37

NOTED FOR MOTION CALENDAR:
April 15, 2022

TABLE CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND1

II. ARGUMENT2

III. CONCLUSION.....4

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37, Plaintiffs¹ respectfully move to compel Defendant Amazon’s participation in a conference pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f), to allow this case, which has now been pending for over two years—and has survived Amazon’s motion to dismiss—to proceed into discovery.

This Action was originally filed on March 19, 2020, alleging that Amazon uses its market power to suppress competition from its own third-party sellers, who also sell on other platforms including Wal-Mart or eBay, by enforcing price restraints whereby Amazon’s third-party sellers agree not to sell their products on other websites for less than they do on Amazon’s own platform. This practice has already come under threat from antitrust regulators in Britain and Germany, as well as the United States Federal Trade Commission, and is a violation of the Sherman Act.

At the time the Complaint was filed, the parties agreed to defer setting the usual initial case deadlines, including the 26(f) conference, until after disposition of Amazon’s anticipated motion to dismiss, Dkt. 5 at 2, and this Court thereafter suspended those deadlines pending its decision, Dkt. Entry, July 14, 2020 (suspending initial case deadlines “pending the Court’s ruling on Defendant’s 11 MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim”). But after careful consideration of Amazon’s motion to dismiss the Amended Complaint, on March 11, 2022, this Court issued a decision largely denying Amazon’s motion, and holding that Plaintiffs adequately pleaded the relevant market, anticompetitive conduct, and antitrust injury. Dkt. 48 at 18, 20-22.

In light of the Court’s decision that Plaintiffs’ case may proceed, Plaintiffs’ counsel met and conferred on March 24 on a Microsoft Teams video call with counsel for Amazon to discuss scheduling a 26(f) conference, and beginning discovery in this long-pending case. Declaration of Steve W. Berman In Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion To Compel 26(f) Conference Under Federal Rule Of Civil Procedure 37, ¶ 1 (filed herewith).

¹ “Plaintiffs” are Deborah Frame-Wilson, Christian Sabol, Samantha Russell, Arthur Scharein, Lionel Keros, Nathan Chaney, Chris Gulley, Sheryl Taylor-Holly, Anthony Courtney, Dave Westrope, Stacy Dutil, Sarah Arrington, Mary Elliot, Heather Geesey, Steve Mortillaro, Chaunda Lewis, Adrien Hennen, Glenda R. Hill, Gail Murphy, Phyllis Huster, and Gerry Kochendorfer.

1 On the call, Amazon responded that Plaintiffs’ request to schedule a 26(f) conference was
2 “premature” because Amazon planned to file a motion for reconsideration of the Court’s order.
3 But, as Plaintiffs’ counsel pointed out on the call, the local rules expressly provide that motions
4 for reconsideration do not stay discovery. *Id.*; see Local Civil Rule 7(h)(2) (“The pendency of a
5 motion for reconsideration *shall not stay discovery.*” (emphasis added)). Amazon’s refusal to
6 engage in a 26(f) conference amounts to nothing more than a self-imposed stay of discovery
7 contrary to the Rules—and Amazon might be one of the largest corporations in the world, but the
8 rules apply to it as they would to anyone else.

9 Permitting Amazon to further delay discovery, even after this Court has denied Amazon’s
10 motion to dismiss, deprives Plaintiffs of the ability to prosecute their case, and unnecessarily
11 extends the schedule for this Action. Plaintiffs respectfully move the Court to order that
12 discovery may commence, and to compel Defendant Amazon to participate in a Rule 26(f)
13 conference within one week of the Court’s issuing an order compelling such participation.

14 II. ARGUMENT

15 More than two years after the initial filing of this Action on March 11, 2022, this Court
16 ruled that Plaintiffs’ allegations of anticompetitive actions by Amazon survived Amazon’s
17 motion to dismiss. This Court issued a decision holding that Plaintiffs plausibly pleaded the
18 relevant market (having pleaded both a U.S. retail ecommerce market, and a series of alternative
19 U.S. ecommerce retail submarkets); that Plaintiffs plausibly pleaded Amazon’s anticompetitive
20 conduct (and that Amazon’s arguments about purported procompetitive justifications for its
21 pricing policies are not appropriate for the motion to dismiss stage); and that Plaintiffs plausibly
22 pleaded antitrust injury (in the form of increased retail prices to consumers). Dkt. 48 at 18, 20-
23 22.

24 Plaintiffs are prepared to prosecute this action, and discovery should proceed promptly.
25 Amazon’s refusal to schedule and participate in a Rule 26(f) conference is inconsistent with the
26 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the practice in this district, and the expectations of the Court
27 and the Parties. *See generally* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26; Local Rule 7(h)(2); Dkts. 5, 9 & Dkt. Entry,
28 July 20, 2020.

1 There can be no dispute about the basic obligations that Rule 26(f) imposes upon both
2 parties in a litigation. Rule 26(f) provides that the parties must conduct a 26(f) conference “as
3 soon as practical,” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f)(1), and that the attorneys on both sides are “jointly
4 responsible for arranging the conference,” and negotiating a discovery plan, Fed. R. Civ. P.
5 26(f)(2). Indeed, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37, a party’s failure to participate in
6 good faith in developing the discovery plan for submission to the court is grounds for an order to
7 pay expenses, including attorneys’ fees. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(f).

8 Now that the Court has ruled that Plaintiffs’ allegations should not be dismissed, it is time
9 to proceed with discovery. Amazon cannot be permitted to unilaterally stay discovery by
10 refusing to participate in the 26(f) conference required by the Federal Rules. Indeed, courts in
11 this district have granted motions to compel participation in such conferences where one party
12 refuses to participate, noting that “gamesmanship surrounding discovery conferences and other
13 actions that prevent [a] matter from moving forward will not be tolerated.” *See Secure*
14 *Channels, Inc. v. Coleridge*, 2017 WL 3026059, at *1 (W.D. Wash. May 1, 2017) (setting Rule
15 26(f) conference deadline); *see also Panyanouvong v. Aphay*, 2014 WL 2986507, at *7-8 (W.D.
16 Wash. July 1, 2014) (compelling attendance at Rule 26(f) conference and awarding attorneys’
17 fees); *ING Bank, fsb v. Fazah*, 2009 WL 3824751, at *3, 5 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 16, 2009), *report and*
18 *recommendation adopted*, 2009 WL 4507722 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 3, 2009) (compelling participation
19 in Rule 26(f) conference).

20 It is no excuse that Amazon has elected to file a motion asking this Court to reconsider its
21 decision. Dkt. No. 51. Setting to the side the fact that Amazon’s motion for reconsideration
22 does not meet any of the standards for such a motion as set forth in this district’s Local Civil
23 Rules, even for a meritorious motion, Local Rule 7(h)(2) expressly provides that “[t]he pendency
24 of a motion for reconsideration *shall not stay discovery* or any other procedure.” (emphasis
25 added). Amazon’s refusal to participate in a 26(f) conference therefore violates the rules of this
26 Court, and impedes Plaintiffs’ proper prosecution of their claims.

27
28

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.