

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

\*\*\*

OSBOURNE RENFROW,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

REDWOOD FIRE AND CASUALTY  
INSURANCE COMPANY, *et al.*,  
Defendants.

2:12-cv-00632-MMD-VCF

**ORDER**

**(Second Motion to Compel (#51), Second Motion for Sanctions (#52), and First Motion to Strike Defendant's Rebuttal Expert (#54))**

15 Before the court is plaintiff Osbourne Renfrow's Second Motion to Compel (#51), Second  
16 Motion for Sanctions (#52), and First Motion to Strike Defendant's Rebuttal Expert (#54). No  
17 Oppositions were filed.

**Background**

18 Plaintiff filed his complaint in the Eighth Judicial District Court, Clark County Nevada, on  
19 March 5, 2012, alleging claims against defendants Redwood Fire and Casualty Insurance Company and  
20 Berkshire Hathaway Homestate Companies arising from an automobile accident wherein plaintiff  
21 suffered injuries causing him "loss of earning capacity, loss wages, physical impairment, mental  
22 anguish, and loss of enjoyment of life..." (#1). Plaintiff alleges that the negligent third-party's  
23 insurance carrier paid the insurance policy limits and that after realizing that the insurance policy limit  
24 was insufficient, plaintiff demanded underinsured policy limits from the defendants. *Id.* Plaintiff states  
25 that defendants failed to make fair payment as required under the policy and that this refusal was  
unreasonable and made in bad faith. *Id.*

1  
2  
3 On April 17, 2012, defendants removed the action to this court based on diversity of citizenship  
4 under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. (#1). Defendants filed their answer on May 4, 2012 (#6), and the court entered  
5 the parties' discovery plan and scheduling order (#9) on June 14, 2012 (#11). On June 22, 2012, the  
6 parties filed a stipulation and order to amend the complaint to name defendant Berkshire Hathaway  
7 Homestate Company in place of defendant Berkshire Hathaway Homestate Companies. (#13). The  
8 court signed the stipulation (#14) and the amended complaint was filed (#15). On August 13, 2012, the  
9 parties filed a stipulation to extend discovery deadlines (#20), and on August 14, 2012, the court signed  
10 the same (#22).

11 On October 24, 2012, the parties filed another stipulation to extend discovery deadlines (#26),  
12 which the court signed on October 25, 2012 (#28). The discovery plan set a discovery cut-off date of  
13 February 28, 2013, expert deadline of December 31, 2012, rebuttal expert deadline of January 30, 2013,  
14 dispositive motions deadline of April 1, 2013, and a Joint Pretrial Order deadline of May 1, 2013.  
15 (#28). Plaintiff filed an *emergency* motion to compel production of claims file and other documents,  
16 request for additional time, and request for sanctions on December 21, 2012. (#30). Defendants filed  
17 an opposition (#32) and a motion to bifurcate, or in the alternative stay discovery of the extra-  
18 contractual claims (#33) on December 27, 2012. A notice of change of attorney on behalf of the  
19 defendants was filed on January 2, 2013. (#37). The court entered a minute order on January 3, 2013,  
20 setting a hearing on the motion to compel (#30). Plaintiff filed his opposition to the motion to bifurcate  
21 on January 13, 2013 (#43), and defendants filed their reply on January 23, 2013 (#44).

22 The court held a hearing on January 30, 2013 on the motion to compel (#30) and the motion to  
23 bifurcate (#33). (#45). The court issued an order on February 1, 2013, granting in part and denying in  
24 part the motion to compel (#30), providing a deadline of March 15, 2013, for plaintiff to disclose his bad  
25 faith expert, ordering the parties to meet and confer regarding a rebuttal expert disclosure deadline, and  
denying the motion to bifurcate (#33). (#46). The parties filed a stipulation for extension of time

1  
2 regarding discovery on February 27, 2013. (#47). The court entered the stipulated amended scheduling  
3 order (#47) on February 28, 2013. (#48). On March 15, 2013, plaintiff filed his first supplement to  
4 initial expert disclosures. (#49).<sup>1</sup> On March 29, 2013, the parties filed a joint interim status report.  
5 (#50).

6 On April 29, 2013, plaintiff filed his second motion to compel (#51) and second motion for  
7 sanctions (#52). Oppositions were due by May 16, 2013. On May 3, 2013, plaintiff filed his first  
8 motion to strike defendants' rebuttal expert. (#54). Oppositions were due by May 20, 2013. As of the  
9 date of the entry of this order, no oppositions were filed.

10 **A. Second Motion To Compel and Motion for Sanctions<sup>2</sup>**

11 **1. Relevant Facts**

12 Plaintiff alleges that defendants are “[y]et again,” refusing to cooperate in the discovery process  
13 in this matter, and that defendant[s] ha[ve] ignored plaintiff’s efforts to resolve this issue without the  
14 court’s intervention. (#51). The time-line of events is as follows:

15 **September 19, 2012:** Plaintiff served defendants with his first set of requests for production of  
16 documents;

17 **November 15, 2012:** Plaintiff received defendants’ responses (#30 Exhibit 2), that were  
18 allegedly “incomplete and evasive” (#51);

19 **December 21, 2012:** Plaintiff filed his first motion to compel (#30);

20 **January 30, 2013:** The court held a hearing on the motion to compel (#30) (#45);

21 **February 1, 2013:** The court issued an order stating that “[d]efendants must produce all  
22 responsive documents to Request Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8 by February 13, 2013, and file under SEAL  
23

24  
25 <sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Local Rule 26-8, “[u]nless otherwise ordered by the Court, written discovery, including responses thereto, and deposition transcripts, shall not be filed with the Court.” Plaintiff’s first supplement to initial expert disclosures (#49) was improperly filed with the court, and is stricken.

<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff filed one document seeking to compel production of documents and to impose sanctions. The clerk separated the document into two separate motions. (#51 and #52).

1  
2 responsive documents to Request Nos. 5 and 6 in conjunction with the filing of the Joint Pretrial  
3 Order.” (#46);

4 Defendants provided plaintiff with additional documentation, but plaintiff alleges that the  
5 documentation was “insufficient yet agin.” (#51). Plaintiff alleges that (1) the claims file  
6 documentation was “littered with redactions,” (2) that the defendants are withholding “all claims  
7 information that was created after the complaint was filed,” (3) that defendants provided “underwriting  
8 file documentation, however many of the documents were not just redacted, but withheld all together,”  
9 and (4) while the privilege log provided indicated that many documents “will be produced,” plaintiff has  
10 yet to receive such documents. *Id.*

11 **February 26, 2013:** Plaintiff’s counsel sent a letter to defense counsel requesting the withheld  
12 information by March 4, 2013. *Id.* (Exhibit 6);

13 **March 13, 2013:** Plaintiff’s counsel, having not heard from defense counsel, sent defense  
14 counsel a letter inquiring as to whether he had received the letter. *Id.* (Exhibit 7);

15 **March 15, 2013:** Defendants provided certification of No Records in their 4<sup>th</sup> supplemental  
16 responses to plaintiff’s request for production of documents, but “still ha[ve] not acknowledged  
17 plaintiff’s communications regarding the withheld documentation.” *Id.* (Exhibit 8).

## 18 **2. Arguments**

19 Plaintiff asserts that “[n]ow, at the eve of close of discovery and plaintiff’s last chance to depose  
20 [d]efendants[’] experts and persons most knowledgeable, [p]laintiff still does not have all pertinent  
21 information from [d]efendant[s] despite making diligent efforts to obtain such information.” (#51).  
22 Plaintiff asks this court to order defendants to “provide [p]laintiff with the withheld information  
23 exclusive of legitimate attorney-client privileged information for which a valid privilege log must be  
24 provided,” and, “due to [d]efendants[’] continued egregious behavior, [p]laintiff respectfully requests  
25

1  
2 that [d]efendant[s] be sanctioned in the form of attorney’s fees and costs and any other sanctions the  
3 Court deems just and proper.” *Id.*

4 Defendants’ oppositions to the motion to compel (#51) and the motion for sanctions (#52) were  
5 due on or before May 16, 2013. No oppositions were filed. As the failure of an opposing party to file  
6 points and authorities in response to any motion constitutes the consent to the granting of a motion, and  
7 the court previously ordered defendants to produce the documents at issue (#46), the court finds that  
8 granting plaintiff’s motion to compel (#51) is warranted. *See* Local Rule 7-2(d). With regard to the  
9 request for sanctions (#52), on or before June 12, 2013, plaintiff must submit to the court an affidavit of  
10 the fees and costs associated with attempting to acquire the withheld documents and the filing of this  
11 motion (#51). On or before June 19, 2013, the defendants must file a response showing cause why  
12 sanctions should not be imposed for the failure to comply with this court’s order (#46). Any reply to  
13 defendants’ response is due by June 26, 2013. A show cause hearing is scheduled for July 24, 2013, at  
14 10:00 a.m.

15 **B. Motion to Strike**

16 **1. Arguments**

17 Plaintiff asserts that when defendants’ “two hand-selected experts both rendered opinions that  
18 supported [p]laintiff’s...claim, [d]efendant[s] started shopping-shopping for another expert,” and that  
19 [d]efendant[s] eventually found an expert that was evidently willing to contradict the opinions of  
20 [d]efendants[’] very own [experts]; two medical professional experts who had actually examined Mr.  
21 Renfrow.” (#54). Plaintiff states the defendants disclosed this expert, Michael R. Klein Jr., M.D.,  
22 F.A.C.S., as a rebuttal expert to its own experts, and that the court should strike the rebuttal expert as  
23 improper, as defendant cannot disclose a rebuttal expert to rebut its *own* experts’ reports. *Id.* The  
24 plaintiff asks this court to strike the rebuttal expert and to preclude him from testifying at trial in this  
25 matter. *Id.* **2. Relevant Law/Discussion**

1  
2 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(2) governs disclosures of experts. In relevant part, it  
3 provides: “(A) a party must disclose to the other parties the identity of any witness it may use at trial to  
4 present evidence under Federal Rules of Evidence 702, 703, or 705,” and “(D) A party must make these  
5 disclosures at the times and in the sequence that the court orders. Absent a stipulation or a court order,  
6 the disclosures must be made: (i) at least 90 days before the date set for trial; or (ii) if the evidence is  
7 intended solely to *contradict or rebut evidence on the same subject matter identified by another party*  
8 under Rule 26(a)(2)(B) or (C), within 30 days after the other party's disclosure.” Fed. R. Civ. P.  
9 26(a)(2)(A) and (D)(emphasis added). Plaintiff argues that defendants’ rebuttal expert Dr. Klein’s  
10 report improperly rebuts *defendants’ own experts’* initial reports and *not* plaintiff’s expert’s reports.  
11 (#54). As defendants did not file an opposition disputing this assertion, the court finds that granting the  
12 motion to strike (#54) is warranted. *See* LR 7-2(d). If plaintiff believes that precluding Dr. Klein’s  
13 testimony at trial is appropriate, he may file a motion *in limine* to the District Judge.

14 Accordingly and for good cause shown,

15 IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Osbourne Renfrow’s Second Motion to Compel (#51) is  
16 GRANTED. On or before June 12, 2013, defendant must produce to plaintiff *all* withheld information  
17 exclusive of attorney-client privileged information for which a valid privilege log must be provided.  
18 Failure to do so may result in the imposition of sanctions.

19 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, on or before June 12, 2013, plaintiff must submit to the court  
20 an affidavit of the fees and costs associated with attempting to acquire the withheld documents and the  
21 filing of the second motion to compel (#51). On or before June 19, 2013, the defendants must file a  
22 response showing cause why sanctions should not be imposed for the failure to comply with this court’s  
23 order (#46). Any reply to defendants’ response is due by June 26, 2013.

24 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a show cause hearing is scheduled for July 24, 2013, at 10:00  
25 a.m.


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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's First Motion to Strike Defendant's Rebuttal Expert (#54) is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part, as discussed above.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Dr. Klein's Rebuttal Expert Report is hereby STRICKEN.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's first supplement to initial expert disclosures (#49) was improperly filed with the court, and is hereby STRICKEN.

DATED this 29th day of May, 2013.



---

CAM FERENBACH  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE