

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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

NOT FOR CITATION
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

FELTON A. SPEARS, JR. and SIDNEY SCHOLL, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FIRST AMERICAN EAPPRAISEIT (a/k/a eAppraiseIT, LLC), a Delaware limited liability company,

Defendant.

Case No. 5:08-cv-00868 RMW (HRL)

**ORDER RE DISCOVERY DISPUTE
JOINT REPORT NO. 4**

[Re: Docket No. 344]

Plaintiffs sue for themselves and on behalf of a certified class of “[a]ll consumers in California and throughout the United States who, on or after June 1, 2006, received home loans from Washington Mutual Bank, FA in connection with appraisals that were obtained through eAppraiseIT.” They claim that defendants engaged a scheme to inflate the appraised values of homes receiving loans in order to sell the aggregated security interests at inflated prices. First American EAppraiseIT (EA) is the only defendant left. Plaintiffs’ sole remaining claim for relief is that the complained-of conduct violates the Real Estate Settlement Practices Act (RESPA), 12 U.S.C. § 2607(a).

In discovery, plaintiffs sought information about EA’s computer systems and procedures in connection with its appraisal services for Washington Mutual. Plaintiffs deposited several

1 witnesses who were named in documents discussing those matters, or who were identified by
2 other witnesses as being knowledgeable about those subjects. Plaintiffs claim that the deponents
3 were only able to give general testimony and could not provide specific information about how
4 EA's electronic systems operated, or when changes took place to those systems. So, on
5 September 27, 2013, plaintiffs served a notice for the Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6) deposition of EA.
6 The deposition was noticed for October 14. But, after defendant pointed out that the 14th was
7 Discoverers' Day, plaintiff offered to have the deposition proceed on October 15, the close of fact
8 discovery.¹ On October 11, EA produced its former president, Anthony Merlo, to testify about
9 portions of Area of Examination No. 10, as well as Area of Examination No. 17. Defendant
10 otherwise objected to the subpoena on the grounds that the deposition was not reasonably noticed,
11 and the topics of examination are overbroad, unduly burdensome, as well as duplicative and
12 cumulative of discovery that has already been obtained.

13 In Discovery Dispute Joint Report (DDJR) No. 4, plaintiffs seek an order compelling EA
14 to produce a Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6) deponent to testify about the noticed topics of examination.
15 The matter is deemed suitable for determination without oral argument. Civ. L.R. 7-1(b). Upon
16 consideration of the parties' respective positions, the court denies plaintiffs' requested discovery.

17 A party wishing to take a deposition must give "reasonable written notice" to all other
18 parties. Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(1). Although ten business days' notice generally is considered
19 reasonable, "the analysis is necessarily case-specific and fact-intensive." In re Sulfuric Acid
20 Antitrust Litg., 231 F.R.D. 320, 327 (N.D. Ill. 2005).

21 EA's deposition was not reasonably noticed.² Contrary to plaintiffs' assertion that they
22 seek testimony on "finite" topics, the noticed areas of examination, as drafted, seek broad
23 discovery about EA's computer systems and procedures. For example, plaintiffs want testimony
24 about "[t]he information, data fields, and data contained [sic] any and all computer systems used
25

26 ¹ Discovery recently has been extended to December 22, 2013 only as to information sought from
third party JPMorgan Chase.


27 ² Although plaintiffs contend that EA was required to move for a protective order, "the
28 requirement to obtain a protective order before failing to appear for a deposition only pertains to
properly noticed depositions." Fernandez v. Penske Truck Leasing Co., L.P., No. 2:12-cv-00295-
JCM-GWF, 2013 WL 438669 at *2 (D. Nev., Feb. 1, 2013).

1 in connection with, or used to store information in connection with, EA’s provision of appraisal
2 services to WaMu,” as well as “[e]ach and every change in the programming for any EA
3 computers [sic] systems in connection with implementing any change to the assignment logic or
4 methodology EA used to assign appraisal work to appraisers for appraisals outsourced to EA for
5 WaMu” between January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2007. (DDJR, Ex. 1).³ Moreover, this court
6 is told that plaintiffs conducted 15 months of merits discovery in addition to years of pre-
7 certification discovery. Thus, it appears that plaintiffs had ample opportunity to conduct discovery
8 in this matter, including the depositions of the witnesses who were identified as knowledgeable.
9 Further, plaintiffs noticed EA’s deposition at the end of the discovery period and at a time when
10 plaintiffs had already noticed thirteen other depositions to take place across the country during the
11 last two weeks before the discovery cutoff. See In re Sulfuric Acid Antitrust Litg., 231 F.R.D. at
12 327 (“What would be reasonable even in a late stage of a relatively simple case with few lawyers
13 may take on a very different cast where, as here, the case is exceedingly complex, the depositions
14 are to occur virtually hours before the discovery cut-off, and it was obvious—or at least
15 probable—that the schedules of the deponents and a number of lawyers would be unable to
16 accommodate the belatedly filed notices.”).

17 Plaintiff’s request for a further Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6) deposition of EA is denied.

18 **SO ORDERED.**

19 Dated: December 18, 2013

20 
21 _____
22 HOWARD R. LOYD
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
24
25
26
27

28 ³ Plaintiffs’ argument that EA did little more than object to the sheer number of noticed topics is belied by the record. (See Dkt. 344, DDJR at ECF pp. 7-9 and Ex. 2).

1 5:08-cv-00868-RMW Notice has been electronically mailed to:
2 Allison Lauren Libeu alibeu@irell.com
3 Alvin Matthew Ashley mashley@irell.com, sknight@irell.com
4 Angela M. Papalaskaris apapalas@dl.com, courtalert@dl.com
5 Christopher J Clark cjclark@dl.com
6 David A. Super david.super@bakerbotts.com
7 Ellen Mary M. Doyle edoyle@fdpklaw.com, filings@fdpklaw.com, gbrown@fdpklaw.com
8 Gretchen Freeman Cappio gcappio@kellerrohrback.com, cbrewer@kellerrohrback.com,
9 eknerr@kellerrohrback.com, tlin@kellerrohrback.com
10 Harry Williams , IV hwilliams@kellerrohrback.com
11 Janet Lindner Spielberg jlspielberg@jlspl.com
12 Jenny Lee Merris jmerris@alvaradosmith.com, mault@alvaradosmith.com
13 Joel R. Hurt jhurt@fdpklaw.com
14 John C. Hueston jhueston@irell.com
15 John Charles Hueston jhueston@irell.com, lhiles@irell.com
16 John M. Sorich jsorich@alvaradosmith.com
17 Jonathan Mark Lloyd jonathanlloyd@dwt.com, jeannecadley@dwt.com
18 Joseph N. Kravec , Jr jkravec@fdpklaw.com, filings@fdpklaw.com, jnk561@yahoo.com
19 Justin Nathanael Owens jowens@irell.com
20 Kevin C Wallace kwallace@dl.com
21 Khesraw Karmand kkarmand@kellerrohrback.com
22 Kris Hue Chau Man kman@dl.com, sholstrom@dl.com
23 Lynn Lincoln Sarko lsarko@kellerrohrback.com, cengle@kellerrohrback.com,
24 kwarner@kellerrohrback.com
25 Margaret Anne Keane margaret.keane@dlapiper.com, carol.stewart@dlapiper.com,
26 marianne.haines@dlapiper.com
27 Martin L. Fineman martinfineman@dwt.com, edithshertz@dwt.com, sfodocket@dwt.com
28 McKean James Evans mevans@fdpklaw.com
Michael D. Braun service@braunlawgroup.com, clc@braunlawgroup.com
Ryan E. Bull Ryan.Bull@bakerbotts.com
Sam N. Dawood samdawood@dwt.com, allanpatterson@dwt.com, cassandrabaines@dwt.com,
nickverwolf@dwt.com
Stephen M. Ng stephen.ng@bakerbotts.com, leanna.gutierrez@bakerbotts.com
Stephen Michael Rummage steverummage@dwt.com, jeannecadley@dwt.com,
seadocket@dwt.com
Sung-Min Christopher Yoo cyoo@alvaradosmith.com, crosas@alvaradosmith.com,
jyoung@alvaradosmith.com, mault@alvaradosmith.com
Tana Lin tlin@kellerrohrback.com, esiegel@kellerrohrback.com, rfarrow@kellerrohrback.com
Wyatt A. Lison wlison@fdpklaw.com, filings@fdpklaw.com