1		
1 2		
2		
4		
5		
6		
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8		
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	SHAWN ESPARZA, on behalf of herself,	No. C 17-03421 WHA
12	and all others similarly situated,	
13	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING LEAVE TO
14	v.	FILE MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
15	SMARTPAY LEASING, INC.,	
16	5 Defendant.	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	that any TCPA violation as to plaintiff was willful then the requested discovery may be	
26	unnecessary (Dkt. No. 60 at 10:10–13). Defendant declined to make such a concession. The	
27	undersigned judge accordingly concluded that the requested information was relevant to	
28	whether or not any TCPA violation as to plaintiff was willful or knowing. The April 20 order	
	directed defendant to respond to plaintiff's discover	

Dockets.Justia.com

In defendant's motion for reconsideration, defense counsel states that she lacked authorization to make a concession regarding willfulness at the time of the discovery hearing. Having further discussed the matter with her client, however, counsel now has such authorization. Defendant accordingly seeks leave to file a motion for reconsideration of the April 20 order. Plaintiff opposes.

Having considered plaintiff's opposition, this order agrees that the extent of defendant's willfulness with respect to any TCPA violation would be relevant to determining whether or not to award treble damages. An award of treble damages is not automatic upon a finding of willful or knowing conduct. Rather, upon finding that a defendant willfully or knowingly violated the TCPA, "the court *may*, in its discretion," increase the amount of the damages award to an amount "*not more than* 3 times" the amount otherwise available under the statute. 8 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3) (emphasis added). Although defendant has offered to concede willfulness, it has not offered to concede treble damages. Defendant's request for leave to file a motion for consideration of the April 20 order is **DENIED**.

By MAY 17, defendant shall file a notice with the Court confirming that it has complied with the April 20 order. Plaintiff's request for sanctions is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: May 10, 2018.

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE