

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 JST DISTRIBUTION, LLC,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 LOVE THINGZ, et al,

15 Defendants.

Case No.: 17-CV-829-W-WVG

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
CONDUCT DISCOVERY ON
DAMAGES**

[ECF NO. 6]

16
17
18 **I. INTRODUCTION**

19 Presently before the Court is Plaintiff JST Distribution, LLC's *ex parte* Motion to
20 Conduct Discovery on Damages. (ECF No. 6.) Defendants did not file an Opposition to
21 the Motion. For the reasons that follow, Plaintiff's Motion is **GRANTED**.

22 **II. BACKGROUND**

23 On April 24, 2017, Plaintiff filed a Complaint alleging the false advertising of
24 Defendant's sexual enhancement products in violation of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. §
25 1125(a)(1)(B). (ECF No. 1.) On June 14, 2017, the Clerk of the Court entered an Entry of
26 Default against Defendants based on their failure to plead or otherwise defend in this action
27 as directed by the Summons and as provided for by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
28 (ECF No. 5.) Plaintiff now seeks leave to conduct discovery on the limited issue of

1 damages pursuant to the Entry of Default.

2 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

3 The scope and limitations of discovery are set forth by the Federal Rules of Civil
4 Procedure. Rule 26 provides in pertinent part that:

5 Unless otherwise limited by court order, the scope of discovery
6 is as follows: Parties may obtain discovery regarding any
7 nonprivileged matter that is relevant to any party's claim or
8 defense and proportional to the needs of the case, considering the
9 importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in
10 controversy, the parties' relative access to relevant information,
11 the parties' resources, the importance of the discovery in
12 resolving the issues, and whether the burden or expense of the
13 proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit. Information
14 within this scope of discovery need not be admissible in evidence
15 to be discoverable.

16 Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(1).

17 District courts have broad discretion in granting or denying discovery. *Hallett v.*
18 *Morgan*, 296 F.3d 732, 751 (9th Cir. 2002) (“broad discretion is vested in the trial court to
19 permit or deny discovery, and its decision to deny discovery will not be disturbed except
20 upon the clearest showing that denial of discovery results in actual and substantial prejudice
21 to the complaining litigant”).

22 Generally, Rule 26(d)(1) provides that “[a] party may not seek discovery from any
23 source before the parties have conferred as required by Rule 26(f), except ... when
24 authorized by these rules, by stipulation, or by court order.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d). Courts
25 apply a “good cause” standard in considering motions to expedite discovery. *Semitool, Inc.*
26 *v. Tokyo Electron Am., Inc.*, 208 F.R.D. 273, 276 (N.D. Cal. 2002); *see also Am. LegalNet,*
27 *Inc. v. Davis*, 673 F. Supp. 2d 1063, 1066 (C.D. Cal. 2009); *In re Countrywide Fin. Corp.*
28 *Derivative Litig.*, 542 F. Supp. 2d 1160, 1179 (C.D. Cal. 2008). Good cause may be found
where the need for expedited discovery, in consideration of the administration of justice,
outweighs the prejudice to the responding party. *Semitool*, 208 F.R.D. at 276.

Good cause for expedited discovery is frequently found in cases in cases where a

1 defendant has failed to appear, resulting in the entry of default against the defendant, and
2 the plaintiff is in need of evidence to establish damages. *See Sheridan v. Oak Street Mortg.,*
3 *LLC*, 244 F.R.D. 520, 522 (E.D. Wis. 2007); *Twitch Interactive, Inc. v. Johnston*, No. 16-
4 CV-03404, 2017 WL 1133520, at *4 (N.D. Cal. 2017); *Adobe Sys. Inc. v. Max Bunhey, et*
5 *al.*, No. 131365, 2013 WL 12140304, at *2 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2013).

6 On June 14, 2017, default was entered against Defendants for failing to plead or
7 otherwise defend in this action. Plaintiff claims, and the Court agrees, a plaintiff may
8 recover defendant's profits, any damages sustained, and the costs of the action in false
9 advertisement claims made pursuant to the Lanham Act. *See* 15 U.S.C. § 1117(a). In this
10 Motion, Plaintiff seeks discovery from payment gateway services and financial institutions
11 of Defendants, one of which is Paypal. (ECF No. 6-1 at 3:25-4:2.) However, since
12 Defendants have refused to participate in this action, Plaintiff cannot conduct traditional
13 discovery.

14 Accordingly, the Court finds that Plaintiff has established good cause to warrant
15 expedited discovery in this matter in order to support an anticipated motion for entry of
16 default judgment and claim for damages. *Semitool, Inc.*, 208 F.R.D. at 276.

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **IV. CONCLUSION**

2 Based on the foregoing, the Court **GRANTS** Plaintiff's *ex parte* Motion. Plaintiff
3 may seek immediate discovery of information sufficient to identify Defendants' profits
4 derived from sales of sexual enhancement products from Defendants' electronic gateway
5 services and financial institutions ("Third-Party Entities").

6 It is further **ORDERED** that Plaintiff must serve a copy of this order on Third-Party
7 Entities when discovery is served. Third-Party Entities that wish to file a motion to quash
8 a subpoena or to serve objections, must do so before the return date of the subpoena, which
9 shall be no less than twenty-one (21) days from the date of service of the subpoena. The
10 Third-Party Entity may use this time to attempt to notify the subscriber in question. Third-
11 Party Entities shall preserve any subpoenaed information or materials pending compliance
12 with the subpoena or resolution of any timely objection or motion to quash.

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14 Dated: October 2, 2017

15 
16 _____
17 Hon. William V. Gallo
18 United States Magistrate Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28