

1  
2  
3  
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 JOHN LOFTON,  
7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 VERIZON WIRELESS (VAW) LLC,  
10 Defendant.  
11

Case No. [13-cv-05665-YGR](#) (JSC)

**ORDER RE: DISCOVERY DISPUTE**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 51, 59

12 Discovery in this putative class action has been referred to the undersigned magistrate  
13 judge. Plaintiff John Lofton seeks to compel documents from Defendant Verizon Wireless  
14 (VAW) LLC (“Verizon”). Presently pending before the Court is a Joint Letter Brief regarding  
15 Verizon’s obligation to produce certain documents in the possession of third-party vendors that  
16 served as debt collectors for Defendant. (Dkt. No. 59.) After carefully considering the parties’  
17 arguments, and having had the benefit of oral argument on November 20, 2014, the Court issued  
18 the following rulings as stated on the record at the hearing.

19 Plaintiff contends that Verizon has failed to produce documents in response to his Request  
20 for Production (“RFP”) Nos. 49 and 50, which both seek records in the possession of six third-  
21 party vendors. (Dkt. No. 59 at 1.)<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff advances several theories to demonstrate Verizon’s  
22 control over these documents, including the contractual relationship between Verizon and its  
23

24  
25 <sup>1</sup> RFP 49 requested “[a]ll documents which support any contention that the dialers Verizon’s debt  
26 collectors used to make telephone calls while collecting the unpaid balance of a Verizon account  
27 from June 2008 to the present do not constitute automatic telephone dialing systems[.]” (Dkt. No.  
28 59-1 ¶ 5.) RFP 50, in turn, requested “[a]ll documents which support any contention that the  
dialers Verizon’s debt collectors used to make telephone calls while collecting the unpaid balance  
of a Verizon account from June 2008 to the present do not constitute predictive dialers[.]” (Id.)  
The third party vendors at issue here include ER Solutions; Inc./Convergent; Sunrise Credit  
Services, Inc.; The CBE Group, Inc.; Valentine & Kebartas, Inc.; Vantage Sourcing, LLC; and GC  
Services. (See Dkt. No. 59 at 7.)

1 vendors, Verizon’s past production of its vendors’ documents, and a purported principal-agent  
2 relationship between Verizon and its vendors. (Id. at 1-5.) Verizon insists that it does not have  
3 control over the documents and argues that Plaintiff’s theory of control would be both  
4 unreasonably burdensome and unmanageable. (Dkt. No. 59 at 7-12; see also Dkt. No. 51 at 6.)

5 Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34, a party must produce any documents under its  
6 “possession, custody, or control.” The party seeking the documents bears the burden of  
7 demonstrating that the responding party exercises such control. *United States v. Int’l Union of*  
8 *Petroleum & Indus. Workers*, 870 F.2d 1450, 1452 (9th Cir. 1989). In the Ninth Circuit, a  
9 “practical ability to obtain the requested documents” from a related organization is not enough to  
10 constitute control because the related organization “could legally—and without breaching any  
11 contract—[ ] refuse to turn over such documents.” *In re Citric Acid Litig.*, 191 F.3d 1090, 1107-  
12 08 (9th Cir. 1999). Instead, “control” is defined as “the legal right to obtain documents upon  
13 demand.” *Id.* at 1107-08.

14 The audit provisions in Verizon’s vendor contracts establish exactly that. (See Dkt. No. 59  
15 at 1.) Specifically, the audit provisions in these contracts provide that “Verizon, through its  
16 authorized representatives, shall have the right, at all times, to examine and audit records, to  
17 include, but not be limited to, copies of” certain types of records. (Dkt. No. 59-1 ¶¶ 9, 11.) The  
18 contracts also explicitly stated that “Verizon’s access to all information in [the vendors’]  
19 possession or control regarding Verizon accounts . . . is to be completely unrestricted.” (*Id.* ¶ 9.)

20 Courts in this district have found that similar contractual language that provides a legal  
21 right to access a third party’s documents gives a party “control” over such records. For example,  
22 in *Doe v. AT&T Western Disability Benefits Program*, No. C-11-4603 DMR, 2012 WL 1669882,  
23 \*3 (N.D. Cal. May 14, 2012), the court considered the defendant’s refusal to produce documents  
24 in the possession of a third-party entity and its subcontractor. The contract between the defendant  
25 and the third-party entities provided that the defendant “shall have the right to conduct . . . full and  
26 comprehensive inspections or audits” of documents in a wide range of subject areas. *Id.* Under  
27 the terms of the contract, the third-party entities were required to “make available all pertinent  
28 records, data, information, and files” to the defendant upon request. *Id.* at \*4. The Court

1 concluded that the contract’s audit and inspection provision gave the defendant a legal right to  
2 demand access to the documents, which amounted to control “within the ambit of [the  
3 d]efendant’s discovery duties under Rules 33 and 34.” *Id.*<sup>2</sup> So it is here. At the hearing on this  
4 matter, Verizon conceded that the contracts with the vendors at issue were still in place such that  
5 the duties and obligations set forth in the contracts still apply. Verizon’s existing legal right to  
6 obtain the vendors’ documents upon demand—and conversely, the vendors’ breach of contract  
7 that would follow from their refusal to turn over the documents—falls squarely within the *Citric*  
8 *Acid* framework for “control.” See *Citric Acid*, 191 F.3d at 1107.

9 The Court is not persuaded by Defendant’s arguments to the contrary. In effect, Verizon  
10 concedes that the audit provisions allow it to access some of its vendors’ documents, but argues  
11 that the scope of that access is not broad enough to give rise to “control” for the purposes of Rule  
12 34. (Dkt. No. 59 at 8-9.) Verizon focuses on the enumerated categories of documents mentioned  
13 in the audit provision, noting that the list does not include records regarding the type of telephone  
14 equipment used—i.e., the information at the heart of RFP Nos. 49 and 50—(*id.*), but this argument  
15 misses the mark. The audit provision clearly states that the list is not exhaustive, instead giving  
16 Verizon the legal right to access records in a wide range of subject matters. (See Dkt. No. 59-1  
17 ¶¶ 9, 11.)

18 To that end, Verizon’s reliance on *Beilstein-Institut Zur Forderung Der Chemischen*  
19 *Wissenschaften v. MDL Information System, Inc.*, No. C 04-05368 SI, 2006 WL 3742244, at \*3-4  
20 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 19, 2006), is unpersuasive. In *Beilstein*, the court found that the defendant was  
21 not obligated to produce records in the possession of a third party on the ground that there was  
22 neither a principal-agent relationship between the entities nor any “contracts between the party and  
23 non-parties explicitly giving the party the legal right to access” records. *Id.* at \*3. But *Beilstein* is  
24 distinguishable: the contract between the entities in that case required the entities to share only  
25 financial and accounting information with each other, and this narrow provision stands in stark  
26

---

27 <sup>2</sup> Because the Court concludes that Verizon exercises control over the vendors for the purposes of  
28 Rule 34, it does not address Plaintiff’s alternative arguments in favor of Verizon’s obligation to  
produce the vendors’ documents.

1 contrast to the audit provision at issue here, which imposes an obligation to provide “unrestricted”  
2 access to “all information” pertaining to Verizon accounts. (Dkt. No. 59-1 ¶ 9.)

3 Finally, Verizon’s concerns about the practical difficulties it imagines in collecting records  
4 from the vendors is similarly unavailing, given that the company has a contractual right to obtain  
5 records from its vendors. (See Dkt. No. 59 at 11-12.)

6 In sum, the Court finds that Plaintiff has met his burden of demonstrating that Verizon has  
7 control over documents in the possession of the six vendors at issue. See *Int’l Union*, 870 F.2d at  
8 1452. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s request that the Court compel Verizon to produce documents in the  
9 vendors’ possession is GRANTED. This conclusion certainly requires Verizon to produce  
10 documents responsive to Plaintiff’s RFP Nos. 49 and 50 but is not limited to this context and may  
11 well have a broader application.

12 This order terminates Docket Nos. 51 and 59.

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14 Dated: November 25, 2014

15   
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17 JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY  
18 United States Magistrate Judge