

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NOT FOR CITATION  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. 8**

[Re: Docket No. 353]

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 in 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 anti-kickback provision of the Real Estate Settlement Practices Act (RESPA), 12 U.S.C. § 2607(a).

At issue in Discovery Dispute Joint Report (DDJR) No. 8 is whether non-party JPMorgan Chase Bank (Chase) should be compelled to produce class members’ HUD Settlement Statements

1 (i.e., HUD-1 forms) pursuant to a document subpoena plaintiffs served on December 2, 2012. The  
2 matter is deemed suitable for determination without oral argument. Civ. L.R. 7-1(b). Upon  
3 consideration of the respective positions set out in DDJR 8, the court grants plaintiffs' requested  
4 discovery.

5 For the better part of the past year, plaintiffs and Chase have conferred numerous times  
6 over the requested HUD-1 forms. Chase eventually agreed to produce certain data about class  
7 members' loans in lieu of producing the HUD-1 forms and other documents plaintiffs requested.  
8 Chase ultimately produced two spreadsheets that, plaintiffs say, did not contain all of the data  
9 Chase agreed to provide.

10 Since then, Chase has produced additional information (and will produce more before the  
11 December 22, 2013 discovery cutoff) addressing plaintiffs' concerns---except for one. Thus far,  
12 Chase says it has been unable to confirm whether the appraisal fee listed in the spreadsheets  
13 actually was the fee paid by the class member (as opposed to the fee Washington Mutual paid EA  
14 for the appraisal service). Plaintiffs contend that this information is critical because it will have a  
15 direct impact on their ability to prove the amount of their claimed statutory damages. Plaintiffs  
16 and Chase quibble about whether plaintiffs asked for clarification re the appraisal fees on October  
17 17, 2013 or some three weeks later on November 6, 2013. But the bottom line is this: Because  
18 the requested information is in the HUD-1 forms, plaintiffs argue that the forms must now be  
19 produced for the approximately 200,000 loans in question and that production must be made prior  
20 to the December 22 discovery cutoff. (Alternatively, if Chase at some point advises that it can  
21 confirm by declaration that the listed fees are the appraisal fees paid by class members, then  
22 plaintiffs will forego production of the HUD-1 forms and rely on the declaration instead.)

23 Pointing out that neither party has reimbursed its significant costs incurred, Chase says that  
24 it has already devoted a substantial amount of time and resources to gathering and producing the  
25 information plaintiffs subpoenaed, and that it continues to do so for certain outstanding categories  
26 of data. As such, Chase says that it simply cannot gather and produce some 200,000 HUD-1  
27 statements, in addition to its other production efforts, before the December 22 discovery cutoff.  
28 Chase suggests that plaintiffs review the sample of 300 loan files it previously produced. Those

1 files contain the HUD-1 statements, and Chase believes that plaintiffs could reasonably ascertain  
2 who paid the appraisal fees. Plaintiffs agree that this may be a viable option, but claim that they  
3 only recently obtained the sampling of loan files and have not yet had a chance to review the  
4 HUD-1 statements. In any event, they express concern that relying on the sample, even if  
5 statistically significant, leaves them vulnerable to an argument by EA that the sampling is not  
6 100% accurate. Additionally, if the sample shows that Washington Mutual sometimes paid the  
7 appraisal fee, then plaintiffs are worried that Judge Whyte might question the propriety of their  
8 reliance on the sample in proving up damages for the class.


9       There is no serious dispute that the requested information is important to plaintiffs' ability  
10 to prove their claimed damages. No one suggests that the information is obtainable or could be  
11 verified through some source other than the HUD-1 forms. True, there are a large number of loans  
12 at issue, but that is commensurate with the nationwide certified class. The specific focus of  
13 Chase's distress appears to be the large volume of documents to be produced, coupled with the  
14 very short time frame for production requested by plaintiffs. Indeed, this matter was brought  
15 before the court less than two weeks before the December 22 cutoff, and at a time when Chase  
16 says it is already swamped with efforts to produce other information subpoenaed by plaintiffs.  
17 This court is not prepared to require plaintiffs to proceed by way of a statistical sampling. There is  
18 disagreement among courts as to the propriety of statistical sampling in class actions, see  
19 generally, Brown v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., No. 5:09-cv-03339 EJD, 2012 WL 5918300 at \*3 (N.D.  
20 Cal., Nov. 15, 2012) (citing cases), and the determination whether plaintiffs properly may prove  
21 damages through a statistical sampling in this case is not one for this court to make anyway.  
22 While the court must protect against undue burden in discovery, Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(C)(iii),  
23 45(c)(1), under the circumstances here, this court concludes that the burden imposed, while not  
24 insignificant, is not undue. Plaintiffs' request for an order compelling production of the HUD-1  
25 forms therefore is granted. However, the court will not require Chase to produce them before the  
26 discovery cutoff, but by a date mutually agreed by plaintiffs and Chase and, if necessary, approved  
27 by Judge Whyte. Additionally, Chase will not be obliged to re-produce HUD-1 forms that were  
28

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

already provided in the 300 sample files.

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: December 20, 2013



---

HOWARD R. LLOYD  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

5:08-cv-00868-RMW Notice has been electronically mailed to:

Allison Lauren Libeu alibeu@irell.com  
Alvin Matthew Ashley mashley@irell.com, sknight@irell.com  
Angela M. Papalaskaris apapalas@dl.com, courtalert@dl.com  
Christopher J Clark cjclark@dl.com  
David A. Super david.super@bakerbotts.com  
Ellen Mary M. Doyle edoyle@fdpklaw.com, filings@fdpklaw.com, gbrown@fdpklaw.com  
Gretchen Freeman Cappio gcappio@kellerrohrback.com, cbrewer@kellerrohrback.com,  
eknerr@kellerrohrback.com, tlin@kellerrohrback.com  
Harry Williams , IV hwilliams@kellerrohrback.com  
Janet Lindner Spielberg jlspielberg@jlspl.com  
Jenny Lee Merris jmerris@alvaradosmith.com, mault@alvaradosmith.com  
Joel R. Hurt jhurt@fdpklaw.com  
John C. Hueston jhueston@irell.com  
John Charles Hueston jhueston@irell.com, lhiles@irell.com  
John M. Sorich jsorich@alvaradosmith.com  
Jonathan Mark Lloyd jonathanlloyd@dwt.com, jeannecadley@dwt.com  
Joseph N. Kravec , Jr jkravec@fdpklaw.com, filings@fdpklaw.com, jnk561@yahoo.com  
Justin Nathanael Owens jowens@irell.com  
Kevin C Wallace kwallace@dl.com  
Khesraw Karmand kkarmand@kellerrohrback.com  
Kris Hue Chau Man kman@dl.com, sholstrom@dl.com  
Lynn Lincoln Sarko lsarko@kellerrohrback.com, cengle@kellerrohrback.com,  
kwarner@kellerrohrback.com  
Margaret Anne Keane margaret.keane@dlapiper.com, carol.stewart@dlapiper.com,  
marianne.haines@dlapiper.com  
Martin L. Fineman martinfineman@dwt.com, edithshertz@dwt.com, sfodocket@dwt.com  
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