

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

FILED  
12 DEC -4 PM 4:17  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
DEPUTY

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MARCELLA ROSE, an individual  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
vs.  
  
SEAMLESS FINANCIAL CORPORATION,  
INC., a Nevada Corporation; MICHAEL  
MCDEVITT, an individual; CHAD  
HAGOBIAN, an individual; JEAN-PIERRE  
RADTKE, an individual; PREMIERE  
CAPITAL ESCROW, INC., a California  
Corporation; LUIS ANTONIO VENEGAS,  
an individual; and DOES 1-100,  
  
Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:11-cv-00240-AJB (KSC)  
  
**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S  
EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR  
LEAVE TO TAKE EXPEDITED  
DISCOVERY**  
  
[Doc. No. 70.]

Before the Court is plaintiff's ex parte motion, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f)(1), to conduct limited discovery. For the reasons outlined below, plaintiff's Ex Parte Application is **GRANTED**.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

Marcella Rose is a 91-year-old woman residing in San Diego, California. The present action was originally filed on December 29, 2010 in state court against defendants Wachovia, Wells Fargo<sup>1</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> Wells Fargo brought the motion individually and on behalf of Wachovia as their predecessor in interest. All further references will be solely to Wells Fargo.

1 Seamless, McDevitt, and Hagobian. [Doc. No. 1-1.] The Complaint contained six causes of action  
2 alleging violations of: (1) the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act, 12 U.S.C. § 2605 (“RESPA”);  
3 (2) the Federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 (“FDCPA”); (3) the California  
4 Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1788 *et seq.* (“Rosenthal Act”);  
5 (4) Unfair Competition provisions under California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*  
6 (“UCL”); (5) common law provisions against fraud and deceit; and (6) the Elder Abuse and Dependent  
7 Adult Civil Protection Act, Cal. Welfare & Institutions Code § 15610.30 (the “Elder Abuse Act”). The  
8 first, second, and third causes of action were alleged solely against Wells Fargo, whereas the remaining  
9 state law causes of action were alleged against all defendants.

10 On February 4, 2011, defendants removed this action to federal court on the basis of federal  
11 question jurisdiction and supplemental jurisdiction over the related state law claims. [Doc. No. 1.]  
12 On February 11, 2011, defendant Wells Fargo filed a motion to dismiss the Complaint, [Doc. No. 2.],  
13 which was subsequently denied as moot after plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint (“FAC”) on  
14 March 4, 2011. [Doc. No. 7.]<sup>2</sup> Thereafter, on March 18, 2011, Wells Fargo moved to dismiss  
15 plaintiff’s FAC. [Doc. No. 13.] On May 25, 2011, plaintiff and Hagobian filed a joint motion for an  
16 extension of time for Hagobian to respond to the FAC. [Doc. No. 23.] While Wells Fargo’s motion  
17 to dismiss was pending, Wells Fargo and Wachovia entered into a good faith settlement with plaintiff.  
18 [Doc. No. 32.] The settlement was approved by the Court on March 2, 2012. [Doc. No. 50.] The  
19 federal causes of action alleged against Wells Fargo were subsequently dismissed. [Doc. No. 56.]

20 Plaintiff filed a Second Amended Complaint (“SAC”) on April 2, 2012. [Doc. No. 53.] The  
21 SAC alleged four causes of action, including violations of: (1) the Elder Abuse Act; (2) common law  
22 provisions against fraud and deceit; (3) breach of fiduciary duty; and (4) unlawful, unfair, and  
23 deceptive practices under the UCL.<sup>3</sup> On May 1, 2012, defendant Hagobian filed a Motion to Dismiss

---

24  
25 <sup>2</sup> On March 16, 2011 this case was transferred from Judge Irma E. Gonzalez. [Doc. No. 12.]

26 <sup>3</sup> The SAC named Seamless, McDevitt, Hagobian, Jean-Pierre Radtke (“Radtke”), Premiere  
27 Capital Escrow, Inc. (“Premiere”), and Luis Antonio Venegas (“Venegas”) as defendants. Defendants  
28 Radtke, Premiere, and Venegas were added as additional defendants by Plaintiff for the first time in  
the SAC. A summons for the SAC was issued on April 3, 2012. [Doc. No. 54]. Defendant Hagobian  
has been served and appeared. Defendant McDevitt has been served with the FAC but not the SAC,  
but has yet to appear. All other added defendants have not yet been served.

1 [Doc. No. 59] and on June 1, 2012, plaintiff filed a motion to remand. [Doc. No. 61.] On August 1,  
2 2012, plaintiff filed the instant motion for an order extending time to serve defendants for ninety days  
3 and to permit limited discovery of defendants' locations. [Doc. No. 69 & 70.] On August 7, 2012 a  
4 response in opposition to the plaintiff's request for expedited limited discovery was filed by the  
5 defendant. [Doc. No. 71.] On August 23, 2012, while the plaintiff's motion for expedited limited  
6 discovery was pending, the Court issued an order granting a ninety day extension of time to serve  
7 defendants. [Doc. No. 72.] On September 10, 2012, the Court issued an order denying the plaintiff's  
8 Motion to Remand, [Doc. No. 61] and granting defendant's Motion to Dismiss the SAC [Doc. No. 59]  
9 with regard to the first three causes of action without leave to amend, and with leave to amend with  
10 respect to the fourth cause of action. Plaintiff was ordered to file an amended complaint within thirty  
11 (30) days of the Order, in the event the plaintiff elected to file an amended complaint with respect to  
12 the fourth cause of action. Defendants' answer was to be due within thirty (30) days of the filing of  
13 the amended complaint.

14 On October 10, 2012, plaintiff filed a Third Amended Complaint ("TAC"). [Doc. No. 74.]  
15 The Complaint contains four causes of action including violations of: (1) the Elder Abuse Act<sup>4</sup>; (2)  
16 common law provisions against fraud and deceit<sup>5</sup>; (3) breach of fiduciary duty<sup>6</sup>; and (4) unlawful,  
17 unfair, and deceptive practices under UCL.<sup>7</sup>

#### 18 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

19 Plaintiff alleges that she is a victim of fraud and elder abuse due to the fraudulent and deceitful  
20 financial practices of defendants. Plaintiff alleges that defendants conspired to fraudulently induce her  
21 to refinance her home and that as a result she paid \$27,000 to enter into a loan that she neither  
22

---

23  
24 <sup>4</sup> This cause of action is asserted against Defendants Seamless, McDevitt, Radtke, Venegas,  
25 and DOES 1-100.

26 <sup>5</sup> This cause of action is asserted against Defendants Seamless, McDevitt, Radtke, Venegas,  
and DOES 1-100.

27 <sup>6</sup> This cause of action is asserted against Premier Capital, Seamless and DOES 1-100.

28 <sup>7</sup> This cause of action is asserted against all defendants. A motion for sanctions is pending by  
defendant Hagobian, but does not appear to affect the current discovery motion at issue. [Doc. No.  
76.]

1 understood nor could afford. [Doc. No. 53, SAC at 4.]

2 Plaintiff further alleges that defendants solicited her to refinance her home, falsified her loan  
3 application, misrepresented her income for the loan application, forged her signature and ultimately  
4 provided her with a deceptively devised financial product. [*Id.* at 5-6.] Plaintiff was eventually unable  
5 to pay the monthly loan payments and was unsuccessful at arranging further modifications to her loan.  
6 [*Id.* at 6,7.] After a foreclosure proceeding was begun against plaintiff's home, a short sale was  
7 arranged at the suggestion of Wachovia. [*Id.* at 7.] As alleged, plaintiff lost her home and all of her  
8 savings as a result of defendant's alleged wrongdoing. [*Id.*]

### 9 DISCUSSION

10 Plaintiff's Ex Parte Application for Leave to Take Limited Discovery seeks an order permitting  
11 very limited, tailored discovery in the form of interrogatories directed to Mr. Hagobian requesting  
12 provision of any and all contact information for the remaining defendants.

13 Discovery is generally not permitted without a court order before the parties have conferred  
14 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f), unless a party obtains a stipulation or court order  
15 to conduct the discovery. FED. R. CIV. P. 26(d)(1). A court order allowing the discovery may be  
16 appropriate when there is good cause or "where the need for the discovery, in consideration of the  
17 administration of justice, outweighs the prejudice to the responding party." *Semitool, Inc. v. Tokyo*  
18 *Elec. Am., Inc.*, 208 F.R.D. 273, 275-76 (N.D. Cal. 2002). "[I]n rare cases, courts have made  
19 exceptions, permitting limited discovery to ensue after filing of the complaint to permit the plaintiff  
20 to learn the identifying facts necessary to permit service on the defendant." *Columbia Ins. Co. v.*  
21 *Seescandy.com*, 185 F.R.D. 573, 577 (N.D. Cal.1999). Courts in the Ninth Circuit generally grant  
22 requests for expedited discovery when the moving party shows good cause. *See also, Gillespie v.*  
23 *Civiletti*, 629 F.2d 637, 642 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1980) (reversing the district court's dismissal of the case with  
24 respect to the doe defendants without permitting discovery from other named defendants). Courts also  
25 consider whether the requested "expedited discovery would ultimately conserve party and court  
26 resources and expedite the litigation." *Semitool*, 208 F.R.D. at 276.

27 Plaintiff has reason to believe that she will be able to locate and serve at least some of the  
28 defendants if she is permitted to obtain information in the possession of Chad Hagobian. [Doc. No.70]


1 at 2.] As indicated in Mr. Salisbury’s Declaration in support of this application, plaintiff has learned  
2 through discussions with Mr. Hagobian’s attorney that Mr. Hagobian was not only the broker of record  
3 for defendant Seamless Financial Corporation, but also may have been its treasurer. [Doc.70-1 at 2.]  
4 The Declaration also states that Mr. Hagobian worked closely with defendant Jean-Pierre Radtke,  
5 President of Seamless. [Id.] Mr. Hagobian did not respond to an informal request for information  
6 regarding the location of the defendants. [Doc. No. 70 at 2.] Plaintiff has requested narrowly “tailored  
7 discovery in the form of interrogatories asking Mr. Habogian to provide all known contact information  
8 for the remaining defendants.” [Id.] Expedited discovery is permissible when it is “narrowly tailored”  
9 to “contribute to moving th[e] case forward” and is not to be a “free ranging” inquiry for which  
10 defendant may not have had ample time to prepare). *Semitool*, 208 F.R.D. at 277 (finding narrowly  
11 tailored expedited discovery permissible when it substantially moves the case forward). Plaintiff has  
12 demonstrated that the narrow discovery requested will likely contribute to moving this case forward;  
13 further, the service of this discovery does not prejudice defendant Chad Hagobian.

14 **CONCLUSION**

15 Based on the foregoing, the Court finds good cause to grant plaintiff’s application for an order  
16 permitting limited expedited discovery pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(d)(1) to obtain  
17 information from Mr. Chad Hagobian concerning the location of the other named defendants.  
18 Therefore, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT** plaintiff’s Ex Parte Application for Leave to Take  
19 Expedited Discovery is **GRANTED**.

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21 Date: December 4, 2012

22   
23 KAREN S. CRAWFORD  
24 United States Magistrate Judge