	Case 2:21-cv-00750-RSL Docu	ment 93 Filed 06/02/22 Page 1 of 14
1		THE HONORABLE ROBERT S. LASNIK
2		
3		
4		
5		
6 7		
8	LINITED STATI	ES DISTRICT COURT
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
10	AT SEATTLE	
11		
12	KAELI GARNER, et al.,) Case No. 2:21-cv-00750-RSL
13	Plaintiffs,) PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL
14	v.) DISCOVERY RESPONSES
15	AMAZON.COM, INC., a Delaware	 <u>NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:</u> June 17, 2022
16	AMAZON.COM, INC., a Delaware Corporation, and AMAZON.COM SERVICE LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company	ES),)
17	Defendants.))
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
	PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY RESPONSES	Byrnes • Keller • Cromwell Llp 38TH FLOOR 1000 Second Avenue
DOO	СКЕТ	
AL		ments without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u> .

1		TABLE	<u>OF CONTENTS</u> PAG	GE(
2	I.	INTRODUCTION		
3	II.	LEGAL STANDARD		
4 5	III.	ARGUMENT		
6			ED TO "ALL DOCUMENTS AND SPONSIVE TO THEIR REQUESTS	
7 8			ED TO A RELEVANT TIME PERIOD HE PRESENT	
9 10			ED TO DISCOVERY REGARDING CTORS AS THIRD PARTIES	
11	IV.	CONCLUSION		
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
	1	TIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL VERY RESPONSES	BYRNES • KELLER • CROMWEI 38TH FLOOR	LL 1

	Case 2:21-cv-00750-RSL Document 93 Filed 06/02/22 Page 3 of 14					
1	1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES					
2	Page(s)					
3	Cases					
4						
5	2002 WL 34420338 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 11, 2002)					
6	<i>In re BofI Holding, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 2021 WL 1812822 (S.D. Cal. May 6, 2021)					
7	Connex R.R. LLC v. AXA Corp. Sols. Assurance,					
8	2017 WL 3433542 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 22, 2017)					
9	Everest Indem. Ins. Co. v. QBE Ins. Corp.,					
10	980 F. Supp. 2d 1273 (W.D. Wash. 2013)					
11	<i>Gsouri v. Farwest Steel Corp.</i> , 2011 WL 3471437 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 8, 2011)					
12	Hall v. Marriott Int'l, Inc.,					
13	2021 WL 1906464 (S.D. Cal. May 12, 2021)					
14	<i>Hatamian v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.</i> , 2015 WL 7180662 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 16, 2015)					
15 16	HP Tuners, LLC v. Sykes-Bonnett, 2018 WL 10398220 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 13, 2018)					
17	Puget Soundkeeper All. v. BNSF Ry. Co.,					
18	2011 WL 13233167 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 15, 2011)					
19	Other Authorities					
20	Discovery Pending Decision on Amazon's Motion to Dismiss. ECF No. 731					
21	Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1)2, 5					
22	Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(b)(2)(B)					
23	Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(b)(2)(C)					
24	<i>Third Party</i> , Merriam-Webster Dictionary, available at https://www.merriam-					
25	webster.com/dictionary/third-party					
26						
	PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY RESPONSES CONVERSION OF AUTOR DOL DISCOVERY RESPONSES CONVERSION OF AUTOR DOL DISCOVERY RESPONSES					

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

Case 2:21-cv-00750-RSL Document 93 Filed 06/02/22 Page 4 of 14

1 Plaintiffs Kaeli Garner, Mark Fladd, Stephanie Fladd, Jodi Brust, John Dannelly, Diane McNealy, Michael McNealy, Lisa Hovasse, Sandra Mirabile, Ricky Babani, Susan Lenehan, 2 3 Jeffrey Hoyt, Lorlie Tesoriero, James Robinson, Rosa Comacho, Eric Dlugoss, Julie Dlugoss, Ronald Johnson, Selena Johnson, Caron Watkins, and Kelly Miller (collectively, "Plaintiffs") 4 5 respectfully submit this memorandum of law in support of this motion, pursuant to L.C.R. 37(a), to compel discovery responses from Amazon.com, Inc. and Amazon.com Services LLC 6 7 (collectively, "Defendants").

8 Pursuant to L.C.R. 37(a)(1), Plaintiffs met and conferred with Defendants to discuss their 9 responses and objections to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for Production on April 12, 2022, April 10 19, 2022, and May 18, 2022. Counsel for Plaintiffs and Defendants (collectively, "the Parties") met and conferred by telephone in an effort to efficiently resolve Defendants' objections to every 11 12 request without the need for Court intervention. After over six hours of telephonic conferences, 13 and several rounds of e-mails and letters, the Parties were able to make some progress. However, 14 there are several ongoing disputes regarding Defendants' remaining objections, which the Parties 15 have been unable to resolve. Now at an impasse, Plaintiffs seek an Order from the Court overruling 16 Defendants' improper objections and compelling Defendants to properly respond to Plaintiffs' 17 Requests.

18 I.

INTRODUCTION

19 As this case enters its second year, Defendants have yet to provide almost any discovery 20in this matter. The Court's Order Setting Discovery and Pretrial Dates (ECF No. 72), entered on 21 February 18, 2022, calls for a close of fact discovery on December 16, 2022. Given that this 22 deadline is just six and a half months away, time is of the essence.

23 Plaintiffs view the need for efficient discovery as a critical component of this litigation and 24 have diligently sought relevant documents from Defendants and third-parties. Defendants, 25 however, have taken a contrary position from the start. Defendants first sought to delay discovery 26 by filing a Motion to Stay all Discovery Pending Decision on Amazon's Motion to Dismiss. ECF

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY RESPONSES

Byrnes • Keller • Cromwell LLP 38TH FLOOR 1000 SECOND AVENUE

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

No. 73. The Court denied this motion signaling that discovery should proceed in full force. ECF
 No. 79.

Despite the Court's Order, Defendants continue to improperly cause delay. For example,
on February 4, 2022, Plaintiffs served their first Requests for Production ("RFPs" or "Requests"
or "RFP Set 1"), seeking relevant information tied to the claims and potential defenses in this
action. *See* Shelquist Decl. Ex. A. Waiting until March 7, 2022, Defendants served their responses
and objections ("R&Os") to RFP Set 1, in which they refused to provide any responsive documents
to any of Plaintiffs' Requests, and asserted approximately fifteen objections, generally and
specifically, to every Request. *See* Shelquist Decl. Ex. B.

Defendants' R&Os are deficient for several reasons, which Plaintiffs highlighted in a letter
to Defendants dated March 28, 2022. *See* Shelquist Decl. Ex. C. Additionally, Plaintiffs requested
to meet and confer with Defendants in an attempt to resolve these issues. Defendants provided
their reply to Plaintiffs' March 28, 2022 letter on April 11, 2022 ("Defendants' April 11, 2022
letter"), in which they revised some of their objections. *See* Shelquist Decl. Ex. D.

For over three months, the Parties have engaged in numerous, lengthy discussions concerning RFP Set 1. While some progress has been made, several foundational issues remain. The issues include: (i) Plaintiffs' entitlement to "all documents and communications" responsive to relevant Requests; (ii) the relevant time period ("Relevant Time Period") governing the Requests; and (iii) the definition of third parties. Plaintiffs seek Court intervention to resolve these issues to allow discovery to go forward.

21

II. LEGAL STANDARD

A party may obtain discovery regarding any non-privileged matter that is relevant to any claim or defense. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1). In responding to a request for the production of documents, the responding party "must either state that inspection and related activities will be permitted as requested or state with specificity the grounds for objecting to the request, including the reasons." Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(b)(2)(B). If the responding party objects, the objection "must

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY RESPONSES BYRNES • KELLER • CROMWELL LLP 38TH FLOOR 1000 SECOND AVENUE

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET A L A R M



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.