

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

G.P.P., INC. d/b/a GUARDIAN  
INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS,

Plaintiff,

v.

GUARDIAN PROTECTION PRODUCTS,  
INC., RPM WOOD FINISHES GROUP,  
INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:15-cv-00321-SKO

**ORDER FOLLOWING INFORMAL  
DISCOVERY DISPUTE CONFERENCE**

\_\_\_\_\_  
GUARDIAN PROTECTION PRODUCTS,  
INC.,

Counterclaimant,

v.

G.P.P., INC. d/b/a GUARDIAN  
INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS,

Counter-defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_  
On June 18, 2020, the Court held a telephonic informal discovery dispute conference regarding clarification of the Court's May 26, 2020 order granting Plaintiff/Counter-defendant

1 G.P.P., Inc. d/b/a Guardian Innovative Solutions (“GIS”)’s motion for leave to supplement the  
2 complaint and reopening discovery. Dylan Liddiard, Esq., Jason Mollick, Esq., and Brian Levy,  
3 Esq., appeared on behalf of GIS. Aaron Rudin, Esq. and Emerson Kim, Esq. appeared on behalf of  
4 Defendant/Counterclaimant Guardian Protection Products, Inc. (“Guardian”).

5 In its May 26, 2020 order, the Court granted GIS’s motion for leave to supplement its  
6 complaint to add an eleventh claim, namely, a cause of action for breach of the Mid-Atlantic, Cook  
7 County, Indiana, Midwest, and Pennsylvania Agreements relating to Guardian’s alleged post-trial  
8 termination of those agreements (the “Eleventh Cause of Action”). (See Doc. 366.) In so doing,  
9 the Court reopened discovery “for the limited purpose of addressing the issue of damages that have  
10 occurred since the trial in this case and as a result of the additional alleged breaches.” (*Id.* at 14.) It  
11 limited each side to “one Rule 30(b)(6) deposition of no more than seven (7) hours, and any limited  
12 necessary written discovery directly related to the depositions.” (*Id.*)

13 As discussed at the conference, the Court’s May 26, 2020 order intended to reopen discovery  
14 “for the purpose of addressing the issue of damages that have occurred since the trial in this case”  
15 as to the claims remanded by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, defined as the “Remanded Claims”  
16 in the Court’s December 13, 2019 Order (Doc. 349), and “as a result of the additional alleged  
17 breaches” alleged in the Eleventh Cause of Action of GIS’s supplemental complaint (Doc. 367).  
18 Thus, the parties may take one Rule 30(b)(6) deposition of no more than seven (7) hours, and any  
19 limited necessary written discovery directly related to the depositions, pertaining to:

- 20 1. Damages that GIS has allegedly incurred since the original judgment was filed on  
21 June 30, 2017 as to the Remanded Claims (as defined in the Court’s December 13, 2019  
22 Order (Doc. 349)); and
- 23 2. Damages that GIS has allegedly incurred as a result of the breaches alleged in its  
24 Eleventh Cause of Action in its supplemental complaint (Doc. 367).

25 ///  
26 ///  
27 ///  
28 ///

1 In light of this clarification, the parties SHALL meet and confer to narrow the scope of their  
2 dispute with respect to the 27 document requests and 14 deposition examination topics currently at  
3 issue. Should the parties require more time to meet and confer and/or complete this discovery, the  
4 Court will consider enlarging the case schedule to accommodate their request.

5 Finally, to the extent any dispute remains as to this discovery, the parties SHALL proceed  
6 as set forth in this Court's Local Rule 251.

7  
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: June 19, 2020

*/s/ Sheila K. Oberto*  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28