14

16

19

21

23

25 26

Dockets.Justia.com

serious injustice, particularly since counsel deliberately chose to wait until after the close of discovery to inform the Halls that he has no intentions of producing the documents. This Court should not accept this type of conduct.

B. The Halls Are Not Required To Explain Why The Documents Are Discoverable.

The second proffered basis upon which defendants seek to avoid producing the requested documents is the Halls' alleged failure to explain why the documents are discoverable. This argument fails for two reasons. First, a party is not required to demonstrate the relevance of discovery unless the answering party has already objected to the request on relevance grounds, and at no time has defendants' counsel objected due to relevancy. Second, pursuant to this Court's Rule 16 Scheduling Order, discovery motions, including responses and replies, are not to exceed two pages each. Had the Court wanted a more in-depth explanation, it presumably would not have limited discovery motions to two pages. Put simply, the discovery sought here is relevant, as it relates to the facts and legal theories of this case.

II. <u>Conclusion</u>.

The Halls have no alternative but to file the Motion because defendants refuse to provide the requested discovery. Defendants have not offered any reason for their refusal to comply. This Court should therefore grant the Motion to Compel.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 4th day of October 2007.

HARPER, CHRISTIAN, DICHTER & GRAIF, P.C.

By /s/ Jeffrey C. Matura
Stephen M. Dichter
Jeffrey C. Matura
2700 North Central Ave., Suite 1200
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

¹ See Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(b)(5); 34(b); 36(a); see also Westchester Fire Ins. Co. v. Household Int'l, Inc., 167 Fed. Appx. 895 (3rd Cir. 2006) (denying motion to compel for failure to demonstrate relevance only after answering party objected to discovery request on such grounds); Valley Eng'rs v. Elec. Eng'g Co., 158 F.3d 1051, 1056 (9th Cir. 1999) (holding that party waived objections to request for production where it did not respond to request).

² Interestingly, defendants violated this Court's Scheduling Order without any explanation when it filed a 6-page response.

1	ORIGINAL of the foregoing electronically filed this 3rd day
2	of October 2007 with:
3	Clerk of Court
4	United States District Court 401 West Washington St.
5	Phoenix, Arizona 85003
6	COPY of the foregoing
7	electronically delivered this 3 rd day
8	of October 2007 to:
9	R. Corey Hill The Cavanagh Law Firm
10	1850 North Central Avenue, Suite 2400
11	Phoenix, Arizona 85004 Attorneys for Defendants
12	
13	s/ Trina Bentley
14	•
15	
16	
17	
18	
19 20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	